arXiv:1605.05084v1 [math.PR] 17 May 2016

PATH DECOMPOSITION OF A SPECTRALLY NEGATIVE LÉVY PROCESS, AND LOCAL TIME OF A DIFFUSION IN THIS ENVIRONMENT

GRÉGOIRE VÉCHAMBRE

Abstract. We study the convergence in distribution of the supremum of the local time and of the favorite site for a transient diffusion in a spectrally negative Lévy potential. To do so, we study the h-valleys of a spectrally negative Lévy process, and we prove in particular that the renormalized sequence of the h-minima converges to the jumping times sequence of a standard Poisson process.

1. Introduction

Let V be a two-sided spectrally negative Lévy process which is not the opposite of a subordinator (in particular, V can not be a compound Poisson process), drifts to $-\infty$ at $+\infty$, and such that $V(0) = 0$. We denote its Laplace exponent by Ψ_V :

$$\forall t, \lambda \geq 0,\ \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda V(t)}\right] = e^{t\Psi_V(\lambda)}.$$

It is well-known, for such V, that Ψ_V admits a non trivial zero that we denote here by κ, $\kappa := \inf\{\lambda > 0,\ \Psi_V(\lambda) = 0\} > 0$.

We are here interested in a diffusion in this potential V. Let us recall that such a diffusion $(X(t),\ t \geq 0)$ in a random càd-làg potential V is defined informally by $X(0) = 0$ and

$$\mathrm{d}X(t) = d\beta(t) - \frac{1}{2}V'(X(t))\mathrm{d}t,$$

where β is a Brownian motion independent from V. Rigorously, X is defined by its conditional generator given V,

$$\frac{1}{2}e^{V(x)}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}\left(e^{-V(x)}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}\right).$$

The fact that V drifts to $-\infty$ puts us in the case where the diffusion X is a.s. transient to the right. In [14], Singh makes the study of the asymptotic behavior of X. When $0 < \kappa < 1$, he proves in particular that

$$X(t)/t^{\kappa} \xrightarrow[t\to+\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{C}\,(1/\mathcal{S}_\kappa)^{\kappa},$$

where $\mathcal{C}$ is some explicit positive constant depending on V and $\mathcal{S}_\kappa$ follows a completely asymmetric κ-stable distribution. Putting this in relation with the results of Kawazu and Tanaka [11], we see that κ plays a similar role as the drift of the brownian environment, at least for the asymptotic behavior of the diffusion. In this paper, we prove that the same is true for the behavior of the local time of X. We denote by $(\mathcal{L}_X(t,x), t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R})$ the version of the local

Date: 18/05/2016 à 00:34:13.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60K37, 60J55, 60G51.
Key words and phrases. Diffusion, random potential, Lévy process, renewal process, local time.

time that is continus in time and càd-làg in space, and we define respectively the supremum of the local time and the favorite site until instant t as

$$\mathcal{L}_X^*(t) = \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}_X(t,x) \quad \text{and} \quad F^*(t) := \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R},\ \mathcal{L}_X(t,x) \vee \mathcal{L}_X(t,x-) = \mathcal{L}_X^*(t)\}.$$

We study the convergence in distribution of $\mathcal{L}_X^*(t)$ and $F^*(t)$ when $\kappa > 1$, and of $\mathcal{L}_X^*(t)$ when $0 < \kappa < 1$. When V is a drifted brownian motion, the case where $0 < \kappa < 1$ has already been studied by Andreoletti, Devulder and Véchambre in [2]. In this case, there is a useful renewal structure obtained from a valleys decomposition of the potential and the Markov property for the diffusion. The limit distribution they obtain involves a κ-stable subordinator and an exponential functional of the environment conditioned to stay positive. When $0 < \kappa < 1$, we extend their result to the diffusion in V and obtain a limit distribution in terms of the exponential functionals of V and its dual conditioned to stay positive :

$$I(V^\uparrow) := \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-V^\uparrow(t)}dt \quad \text{and} \quad I(\hat{V}^\uparrow) := \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\hat{V}^\uparrow(t)}dt,$$

where $\hat{V}$, the dual of V, is equal in law to $-V$. It is proved in Theorems 1.1 and 1.11 of Véchambre [15] that these functionals are indeed finite and well-defined. The fact, proved in [15], that $I(V^\uparrow)$ and $I(\hat{V}^\uparrow)$ admit some finite exponential moments is of fundamental interest for our generalization of the results of [2].

The almost sure asymptotic behavior of the local time is studied, in the discrete transient case, by Gantert and Shi [10]. We believe that the present work will allow us, in the future, to link the asymptotic almost sure behavior of $\mathcal{L}_X^*(t)$ with the left tail of $I(V^\uparrow)$. This tail is given in [15] and can be very different, when V is a general spectrally negative Lévy process, than when V is a drifted brownian motion. As a consequence we can expect, in the Lévy case, many possible behaviors for the almost sure asymptotic of $\mathcal{L}_X^*(t)$, and this is our main motivation to generalize, here, the study of [2] to the Lévy case.

When $\kappa > 1$, we adopt the point of view of [14] and link the local time to a generalized Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. This approach also provides the convergence of the favorite site and can certainly be used to study the almost sure behavior of the supremum of the local time.

1.1. **Main results.** Our main results are the convergences in distribution for the supremum of the local time. Let us define the constants K and m similarly as in [14] :

$$K := \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(t)}dt\right)^{\kappa-1}\right] \quad \text{and} \quad m := \frac{-2}{\Psi_V(1)} > 0,$$

and for any $\alpha, s > 0$, let $\mathcal{F}(\alpha, s)$ denote the Fréchet distribution with parameters α and s, that is, the distribution with repartition function

$$\mathcal{F}(\alpha, s)\left([0,t]\right) = e^{-(s/t)^\alpha}.$$

When $\kappa > 1$, the limit distribution of the supremum of the local time can be expressed as follows :

Theorem 1.1. *If $\kappa > 1$,*

$$\mathcal{L}_X^*(t)/t^{1/\kappa} \xrightarrow[t\to+\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{F}(\kappa, 2(\Gamma(\kappa)\kappa^2 K/m)^{1/\kappa}).$$

Examples : In some cases the parameters of the limit distribution are more explicit.

- Let W_κ be the κ-drifted brownian motion : $W_\kappa(t) := W(t) - \frac{\kappa}{2}t$. If we choose $V = W_\kappa$ (for $\kappa > 1$), then $K = 2^{\kappa-1}/\Gamma(\kappa)$ (see Example 1.1 in [14]) and $m = 4/(\kappa-1)$. The limit distribution of the supremum of the local time is therefore $\mathcal{F}(\kappa, 4(\kappa^2(\kappa-1)/8)^{1/\kappa})$. This is precisely the second point of Theorem 1.6 of Devulder [6].
- If V is such that $\kappa = 2$ then
$$K = \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(t)}dt\right] = \int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{V(t)}\right] dt = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{t\Psi_V(1)}dt = \frac{-1}{\Psi_V(1)} = \frac{m}{2},$$
and the limit distribution of $\mathcal{L}_X^*(t)/t^{1/2}$ is therefore $\mathcal{F}(2, 2\sqrt{2})$.

We also prove that the distribution of the favorite site is asymptotically uniform :

Theorem 1.2. *If $\kappa > 1$,*
$$mF^*(t)/t \xrightarrow[t\to+\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{U},$$
where $\mathcal{U}$ denotes the uniform distribution on $[0,1]$.

When $0 < \kappa < 1$, we have to introduce some notations in order to express the limit distribution. Let G_1 and G_2 be two independent random variables with $G_1 \overset{\mathfrak{L}}{=} I(V^\uparrow)$ and $G_2 \overset{\mathfrak{L}}{=} I(\hat{V}^\uparrow)$. We define $\mathcal{R} := G_1 + G_2$. $\mathcal{R}$ is the analogue of $\mathcal{R}_\kappa$ defined in [2] (if V if the κ-drifted brownian motion, then $\mathcal{R} \overset{\mathfrak{L}}{=} \mathcal{R}_\kappa$. Note that $W_\kappa^\uparrow \overset{\mathfrak{L}}{=} \hat{W}_\kappa^\uparrow$, so $\mathcal{R}_\kappa$ is the sum of two independent copies of $I(W_\kappa^\uparrow)$). Let also $\mathcal{C}$ be the constant in Corollary 5 of Bertoin, Yor [4] and $\mathcal{C}' := (\mathcal{C}/2)\int_0^{+\infty} u^\kappa e^{-u/2}du$. Now, let $\mathcal{Y}_1$ be the κ-stable subordinator with Laplace exponent $\mathcal{C}'\Gamma(1-\kappa)\lambda^\kappa$:
$$\forall t, \lambda \geq 0,\ \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\lambda\mathcal{Y}_1(t)}\right] = e^{-t\mathcal{C}'\Gamma(1-\kappa)\lambda^\kappa}.$$
We now consider the pure jump Lévy process $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ where the component $\mathcal{Y}_2$ is defined multiplying each jump of $\mathcal{Y}_1$ by an independent copy of $\mathcal{R}$. We can also define $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ from its κ-stable Lévy measure ν supported on $]0,+\infty[\times]0,+\infty[$ and defined by
$$\forall x > 0, y > 0,\ \nu\left([x,+\infty[\times[y,+\infty[\right) = \frac{\mathcal{C}'}{y^\kappa}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{R}^\kappa \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{R}\leq\frac{y}{x}}\right] + \frac{\mathcal{C}'}{x^\kappa}\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{R} > \frac{y}{x}\right).$$
It is easy to see that the first definition implies the second and also that the Lévy process $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ has Laplace transform
$$\forall t, \alpha, \beta \geq 0,\ \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\alpha\mathcal{Y}_1(t)-\beta\mathcal{Y}_2(t)}\right] = e^{-t\mathcal{C}'\Gamma(1-\kappa)\mathbb{E}[(\alpha+\beta\mathcal{R})^\kappa]}.$$
As in [2], our limit distribution for the supremum of the local time is a function of $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$. For Z an increasing càd-làg process and $s \geq 0$, we put respectively $Z(s-)$, $Z^\natural(s)$ and $Z^{-1}(s)$ for respectively the left-limit of Z at s, the largest jump of Z before s and the generalized inverse of Z at s :
$$Z(s-) = \lim_{\substack{r\to s\\ <}} Z(r),\ Z^\natural(s) := \sup_{0\leq r\leq s}(Z(r) - Z(r-)),\ Z^{-1}(s) := \inf\{u \geq 0,\ Z(u) > s\},$$
where $\inf\emptyset = +\infty$ by convention. We now define the couple of random variables $(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2)$:
$$\mathcal{I}_1 := \mathcal{Y}_1^\natural(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)-),\ \mathcal{I}_2 := \left(1 - \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)-)\right) \times \frac{\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)) - \mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)-)}{\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)) - \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)-)},$$
and we have

Theorem 1.3. *If $0 < \kappa < 1$, V has unbounded variations and $V(1) \in L^p$ for some $p > 1$ then*
$$\mathcal{L}_X^*(t)/t \xrightarrow[t\to+\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{I} := \max(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2).$$

This result is a generalization, for more general environments, of Theorem 1.3 of [2]. A key point in its proof is the fact that the contributions to the local time and to the time spent by the diffusion between the bottoms of two consecutive valleys are negligible, so the local maxima of the local time are localized at the bottom of the valleys, where most of the time is spent. This is where appears the pure jump subordinator $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ with two correlated components, one for the local time, and one for the time spent. Each jump of $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ represents the contribution of the bottom of a valley to these two quantities.

Our generalization of the results known in the brownian case also yields some other results such as the convergence of the supremum of the local time before and after the last valley (the first two points of Theorem 1.5 in [2]).

When $0 < \kappa < 1$, our study relies deeply on the decomposition of the potential into h-valleys and on the localization of the contributions to the local time and to the time spent near the h-minima. In fact, we have to make h going to infinity when t goes to infinity, this is why we briefly study the asymptotic of the h-valleys. The definition of the h-extrema and h-valleys are given in the next section but we already note the following result about the asymptotic of $(m_1, m_2, ...)$, the sequence of h-minima.

Theorem 1.4. *When h goes to infinity, the renormalized random sequence $e^{-\kappa h}(m_1, m_2, ...)$ converges in distribution to the jumping times sequence of a standard Poisson process with parameter q (which depends explicitly on the law of V). If $V = W_\kappa$, the κ-drifted brownian motion, then $q = \kappa^2/2$.*

Some of the estimates used to prove this theorem will also be useful to establish the negligibility of the local time between the bottoms of two consecutive valleys when $0 < \kappa < 1$. However, the main interest of this theorem is that it informs us on the typical distance between two consecutive minima, and this provides an heuristic explanation for why the method based on valleys fails when $\kappa > 1$.

As we can see in Theorem 1.4, the distance between two consecutive h-minima is of order $e^{\kappa h}$. In the case $0 < \kappa < 1$, what happens between the bottoms of the h-valleys can be neglected, so the main contributions to the local time and to the time spent by the diffusion are localized at the h-minima and are highly correlated, this explains the form of the limit distribution for the favorite site given in [2]. When $\kappa > 1$, this distance between two consecutive h-minima is so large that the time spent by the diffusion between the h-minima is no longer negligible compared to the time spent in the bottoms of the h-valleys, and there are extreme values taken by the local time between the h-valleys. In fact, it is impossible to use the valleys to localize the large values of the local time as we do when $0 < \kappa < 1$, this explains the asymptotic uniform distribution for the favorite site. Moreover, the case $\kappa > 1$ is the case where X has positive speed. The local time at time t is then close to the local time at the hitting time of t/m and the latter can be expressed thanks to a generalized Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. The supremum of the local time is therefore similar to the supremum of the heights of *iid* excursions of a Markov process. This explains the appearance of a Fréchet distribution in the limit distribution.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we study the case where $\kappa > 1$ and prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. In section 3 we recall the definitions of the h-extrema and h-valleys for V and establish some usual properties such as the independence of the consecutive slopes and the law of the bottoms of the valleys. We end this section by proving Theorem 1.4. In section 4 we assume $0 < \kappa < 1$ and prove Theorem 1.3. In section 5 we prove some fundamental estimates on V, $V^\uparrow$ and $\hat{V}^\uparrow$ and some technical results.

1.2. **Facts and notations.** We denote by (Q,γ,ν) the generating triplet of V so Ψ_V can be expressed as

$$\Psi_V(\lambda)=\frac{Q}{2}\lambda^2-\gamma\lambda+\int_{-\infty}^{0}(e^{\lambda x}-1-\lambda x\mathbb{1}_{|x|<1})\nu(dx). \tag{1.1}$$

If V jumps at instant u we denote $\Delta V(u):=V(u)-V(u-)$, the jump of V at u. For $r>0$, we define $V^{<-r}$ to be the sum of the jumps of V that are less than $-r$:

$$\forall s\geq 0,\ V^{<-r}(s):=\sum_{0\leq u\leq s}\Delta V(u)\mathbb{1}_{\{\Delta V(u)<-r\}}.$$

V is the sum of the processes $V-V^{<-r}$ and $V^{<-r}$ that can be seen to be independent spectrally negative Lévy processes, thanks to the Lévy-Kintchine formula (1.1). According to Corollary VI.2 of Bertoin [3] we have $\mathbb{E}[V(1)]<0$ so for r chosen large enough we have $\mathbb{E}[(V-V^{<-r})(1)]<0$ which, thanks to Corollary VI.2 of [3], implies that $V-V^{<-r}$ drifts to $-\infty$. In other words, removing the very large jumps of V does not change its convergence to $-\infty$.

For Y a process and S a borelian set, we denote

$$\tau(Y,S):=\inf\{t\geq 0,\ Y(t)\in S\},\quad \mathcal{K}(Y,S):=\sup\{t\geq 0,\ Y(t)\in S\}.$$

We shall only write $\tau(Y,x)$ instead of $\tau(Y,\{x\})$ and $\tau(Y,x+)$ instead of $\tau(Y,[x,+\infty[)$. Since V has no positive jumps we see that it reaches each positive level continously : $\forall x>0,\tau(V,x+)=\tau(V,x)$. Moreover, the law of the supremum of V is known, it is an exponential distribution with parameter κ (see Corollary V.II in [3]).

$\underline{Y}$ denotes the infimum process of Y : $\forall t\geq 0,\ \underline{Y}(t):=\inf_{[0,t]}Y$. The process $V-\underline{V}$ is known as the process V reflected at its infimum, note that Proposition VI.1 of [3] tells that it is a càd-làg Markov process. The same holds for $\hat{V}-\underline{\hat{V}}$.

If Y is Markovian and $x\in\mathbb{R}$ we denote Y_x for the process Y starting from x. For Y_0 we shall only write Y. For any (possibly random) time $T>0$, we write Y^T for the process Y shifted and centered at time T : $\forall s\geq 0,\ Y^T(s):=Y(T+s)-Y(T)$.

Let B be a brownian motion starting at 0 and independent from V. A diffusion in potential V can be defined via the formula :

$$X(t):=A_V^{-1}(B(T_V^{-1}(t))). \tag{1.2}$$

where

$$A_V(x):=\int_0^x e^{V(u)}du \text{ and for } 0\leq s\leq \tau\left(B,\int_0^{+\infty}e^{V(u)}du\right),\ T_V(s):=\int_0^s e^{-2V(A_V^{-1}(B(u)))}du.$$

It is known that the local time of X at x until instant t has the following expression :

$$\mathcal{L}_X(t,x)=e^{-V(x)}\mathcal{L}_B(T_V^{-1}(t),A_V(x)). \tag{1.3}$$

For the hitting times of $r\in\mathbb{R}$ by the diffusion X we shall use the frequent notation $H(r)$ (instead of $\tau(X,r)$). We denote by $H_+(r)$ (respectively $H_-(r)$) the total time spent by the diffusion in $[0,+\infty[$ (respectively $]-\infty,0]$) before $H(r)$.

The quenched probability measure P^V is the probability measure conditionally on the potential V. When we deal we events relative to the diffusion X, $\mathbb{P}$ represents the annealed probability measure, it is defined as $\mathbb{P}:=\int P^\omega(.)P(V\in d\omega)$.

We often denote by d_{VT} the total variation distance between two probability distributions on the same space.

2. Supremum of the local time when $\kappa > 1$

We now treat the case $\kappa > 1$. Since some of the lemmas we state in this section are true in a general context we do not assume $\kappa > 1$ yet. We thus have $\kappa \in]0, +\infty[$ unless mentioned otherwise. As we mentioned in the introduction, the valleys are of no use in this section so we have to study directly the expression of the local time. It is given by (1.3). According to [14], if $m := -2/\psi_V(1)$, then t is close to $H(t/m)$ (when $\kappa > 1$ and t is large). It is then convenient to look at the local time until the hitting times. It has a simpler expression :

$$\mathcal{L}_X(H(r), x) = e^{-V(x)}\mathcal{L}_B(\tau(B, A_V(r)), A_V(x)). \tag{2.4}$$

The supremum of the local time until instant $H(r)$ can thus be written

$$\mathcal{L}^*_X(H(r)) = \max\{\mathcal{M}_1(r), \mathcal{M}_2(r)\}, \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}_1(r) &:= \sup_{x<0} \mathcal{L}_X(H(r), x) = \sup_{x<0} e^{-V(x)}\mathcal{L}_B(\tau(B, A_V(r)), A_V(x)) \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{x<0} e^{-V(x)}\right) \times \left(\sup_{x<0} \mathcal{L}_B(\tau(B, A_V(+\infty)), A_V(x))\right) < +\infty \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$\mathcal{M}_2(r) := \sup_{x\in[0,r]} \mathcal{L}_X(H(r), x) = \sup_{x\in[0,r]} e^{-V(x)}\mathcal{L}_B(\tau(B, A_V(r)), A_V(x)).$$

We also define the favorite positive site until time $H(r)$ by

$$F^*_+(H(r)) := \text{argmax}_{[0,r]}\mathcal{L}_X(H(r), .) := \inf\left\{x \in [0, r],\ \mathcal{L}_X(H(r), x) \vee \mathcal{L}_X(H(r), x-) = \mathcal{M}_2(r)\right\}.$$

To lighten the notations, we often use the notation *argmax* in this section. Now, note that $\mathcal{M}_2(r)$ is the same as $J_2(r)$ of [14] with a supremum on $[0, r]$ in place of an integral on this interval. In particular, if, similarly to [14], we define

$$Z(x) := e^{V(x)} R\left(\int_0^x e^{-V(y)} dy\right),$$

where R is a two-dimensional squared Bessel process independent from V, we get

$$\mathcal{M}_2(r) \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} \sup_{x\in[0,r]} Z(x) \quad \text{and} \quad F^*_+(H(r)) \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} r - \text{argmax}_{[0,r]} Z. \tag{2.7}$$

We can therefore prove our results using some precise properties of Z. Recall from [14] the definition of L, the local time of Z for the position 1, of n the associated excursion measure, and of L^{-1} the right continus inverse of L. We denote by ξ a generic excursion.

2.1. The local time at hitting times.

We now prove a lemma to justify rigorously that the local time of the diffusion at some instant can be approximated by the local time at an hitting time.

Lemma 2.1. *Let us denote by Q the positive constant denoted by $n[\zeta]$ in [14], for r large enough we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(L^{-1}(r/Q - r^{3/4}) \leq r \leq L^{-1}(r/Q + r^{3/4})\right) \geq 1 - r^{-1/4}. \tag{2.8}$$

Assume $\kappa > 1$. For any $\alpha \in]\max\{3/4, 1/\kappa\}, 1[$ their exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for r large enough we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(H(r/m - r^\alpha) \leq r \leq H(r/m + r^\alpha)\right) \geq 1 - r^{-\epsilon}, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}^*_X(H(r/m - r^\alpha)) \leq \mathcal{L}^*_X(r) \leq \mathcal{L}^*_X(H(r/m + r^\alpha))\right) \geq 1 - r^{-\epsilon}. \tag{2.10}$$

Proof. According to Lemma 5.1 in [14], $\mathbb{E}[L^{-1}(1)] = Q$ and the subordinator L^{-1} admits some finite positive exponential moments, so, in particular, it has moments of the second order. Let us define the Lévy process $U(t) := L^{-1}(t) - Qt$. U has finite mean equal to 0 and moments of the second order, this implies that $\mathbb{E}[|U(t)|^2] = t\mathbb{E}[|U(1)|^2]$. Using Markov's inequality we get

$$\forall t, s > 0,\ \mathbb{P}\left(|U(t)| > s\right) \leq s^{-2}\mathbb{E}\left[|U(t)|^2\right] = s^{-2}t\mathbb{E}\left[|U(1)|^2\right]. \tag{2.11}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(r > L^{-1}(r/Q + r^{3/4})\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(|L^{-1}(r/Q + r^{3/4}) - (r + Qr^{3/4})| > Qr^{3/4}\right)\\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(|U(r/Q + r^{3/4})| > Qr^{3/4}\right) \leq (r/Q + r^{3/4})\mathbb{E}\left[|U(1)|^2\right]/Q^2 r^{3/2},\end{aligned}$$

where we used (2.11) with $t = r/Q + r^{3/4}$ and $s = Qr^{3/4}$. We get a similar estimate for $\mathbb{P}\left(r < L^{-1}(r/Q - r^{3/4})\right)$ so (2.8) follows. We now turn to (2.9). Until the end of this proof we assume $\kappa > 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(H(r/m - r^\alpha) > r\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(H_-(r/m - r^\alpha) + H_+(r/m - r^\alpha) - (r - mr^\alpha) > mr^\alpha\right)\\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(H_-(+\infty) > mr^\alpha/2\right)\\ &+ \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{r/m - r^\alpha} Z(x)dx - (r - mr^\alpha) > mr^\alpha/2\right),\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

because, as we can see from [14], $\int_0^t Z(x)dx$ has the same law as $H_+(t)$ (denoted by $J_2(t)$ there). The second term in the right hand side of (2.12) is less than

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{\tau(Z,1)} Z(x)dx > mr^\alpha/4\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tau(Z,1)}^{r/m - r^\alpha} Z(x)dx - (r - mr^\alpha) > mr^\alpha/4\right)\\ \leq&\mathbb{P}\left(\tau(Z,1) > mr^\alpha/4\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{r/m - r^\alpha} Z_1(x)dx - (r - mr^\alpha) > mr^\alpha/4\right),\end{aligned}$$

where we put $Z_1 := Z(\tau(Z,1) + .)$. It is well defined since Z has no positive jumps and thus reaches $[1, +\infty[$ continuously. Since Z is a Markov process, Z_1 has indeed the same law as Z starting from 1. According to Proposition 4.3 of [14] :

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau(Z,1) > t) \leq e^{-ct}, \tag{2.13}$$

for some constant $c > 0$ when t is large enough. We now put this in (2.12) where we also use Lemma 5.18 for the term $\mathbb{P}(H_-(+\infty) > mr^\alpha/2)$, we obtain for r large enough

$$\mathbb{P}\left(H(r/m - r^\alpha) > r\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\int_0^{r/m - r^\alpha} Z_1(x)dx - (r - mr^\alpha)\right| > mr^\alpha/4\right) + c_1 r^{-\frac{\alpha\kappa}{2+\kappa}}, \tag{2.14}$$

for some positive constant c_1. Let us define $\tilde{U}(t) := \int_0^{L^{-1}(t)} Z_1(x)dx - mL^{-1}(t)$. Note that, from Section 7 of [14] we can see that $\tilde{U}$ is a Lévy process with finite mean equal to 0 and such that $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{U}(1) > x) \sim_{x\to+\infty} cx^{-\kappa}$ for some positive constant c. As a consequence, $\mathbb{E}[|\tilde{U}(1)|^\gamma] < +\infty$ for $\gamma \in]1/\alpha, \kappa[$. We choose such a γ and use successively Markov's and Von Barh-Esseen's inequalities :

$$\forall t, s > 0,\ \mathbb{P}\left(|\tilde{U}(t)| > s\right) \leq s^{-\gamma}\mathbb{E}\left[|\tilde{U}(t)|^\gamma\right] \leq 2s^{-\gamma}\left(\lfloor t\rfloor\mathbb{E}\left[|\tilde{U}(1)|^\gamma\right] + \sup_{s\in[0,1]}\mathbb{E}\left[|\tilde{U}(s)|^\gamma\right]\right). \tag{2.15}$$

We now use (2.8) and get that for y large enough, $y \leq L^{-1}(y/Q + y^{3/4})$ with probability greater than $1 - y^{-1/4}$ so

$$\int_0^y Z_1(x)dx - my \leq \int_0^{L^{-1}(y/Q+y^{3/4})} Z_1(x)dx - my = \tilde{U}(y/Q + y^{3/4}) + mU(y/Q + y^{3/4}) + mQy^{3/4}.$$

Let C be an arbitrary positive constant. Applying (2.15) and (2.11) with $t = y/Q + y^{3/4}$ and $s = Cy^\alpha$ we get for y large enough

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^y Z_1(x)dx - my > Cy^\alpha\right) \leq c_2\left(y^{1-\alpha\gamma} + y^{1-2\alpha} + y^{-1/4}\right),$$

for some positive constant c_2, depending on C. We prove a similar inequality for $my - \int_0^y Z_1(x)dx$ so we have actually, for c_3 a positive constant (depending on C) and y large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\int_0^y Z_1(x)dx - my\right| > Cy^\alpha\right) \leq c_3\left(y^{1-\alpha\gamma} + y^{1-2\alpha} + y^{-1/4}\right). \tag{2.16}$$

Applying (2.16) with a good choice of C, $y = r/m - r^\alpha$ and putting into (2.14) we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(H(r/m - r^\alpha) > r\right) \leq r^{-\epsilon}/2, \tag{2.17}$$

if $\epsilon > 0$ is chosen to be less than $\max\{\alpha\gamma - 1, 2\alpha - 1, \alpha\kappa/(2+\kappa), 1/4\}$ and r is large enough. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(H(r/m + r^\alpha) < r\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(H_+(r/m + r^\alpha) < r\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tau(Z,1)}^{r/m+r^\alpha} Z(x)dx < r\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{r/m+r^\alpha/2} Z_1(x)dx < r\right) + \mathbb{P}(\tau(Z,1) > r^\alpha/2),\end{aligned}$$

so, using (2.13) and (2.16), we conclude the same way as for $\mathbb{P}(H(r/m - r^\alpha) > r)$: we get $\mathbb{P}\left(H(r/m + r^\alpha) < r\right) \leq r^{-\epsilon}/2$ for r large enough, and combining with (2.17) we get (2.9).

Finally, (2.10) is only a consequence of (2.9) and of the increases of $\mathcal{L}_X^*$.

□

We also need an almost sure version of (2.8) :

Lemma 2.2. *Almost surely, for all t large enough we have*

$$Qt - t^{3/4} \leq L^{-1}(t) \leq Qt + t^{3/4}.$$

Proof. Since $L^{-1}(1)$ admits some finite exponential moments we have an iterated logarithme law. □

Now, we study the supremum of the process Z in terms of its excursion measure n.

Lemma 2.3. *There is $\epsilon > 0$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that for all $r \geq r_0$ and $h > 1$ we have*

$$e^{-(r/Q+r^{7/8})n(\sup\xi>h)} - r^{-\epsilon} \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in[0,r]} Z(x) \leq h\right) \leq e^{-(r/Q-r^{7/8})n(\sup\xi>h)} + r^{-\epsilon}.$$

Proof. Recall the definition of Z_1 in the proof of Lemma 2.1. For $h > 1$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in[0,r]} Z(x) \leq h\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in[\tau(Z,1),r]} Z(x) \leq h\right) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in[0,r]} Z_1(x) \leq h\right), \tag{2.18}$$

because of the Markov property and the fact that the length of $[\tau(Z,1),r]$ is less than r. Let us choose $\eta \in]0,3/4[$. We have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in[\tau(Z,1),r]} Z(x) \le h\right) \le \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in[0,r-r^\eta]} Z_1(x) \le h\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(Z,1) > r^\eta\right) \tag{2.19}$$

From (2.18), (2.19) and (2.13), we see that we only need to prove the lemma with Z_1 instead of Z and $r^{3/4}$ instead of $r^{7/8}$. We only prove the lower bound, since the proof of the upper bound is similar. For r large enough so that (2.8) is true we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in[0,r]} Z_1(x) \le h\right) \ge \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in[0,L^{-1}(r/Q+r^{3/4})]} Z_1(x) \le h\right) - r^{-1/4},$$

and from the point of view of excursions, the probability in the right hand side is only the probability that no excursion higher than h occurs before L exceeds $r/Q + r^{3/4}$. It is known, from properties of Poisson point processes, that this probability equals $e^{-(r/Q+r^{3/4})n(\sup\xi>h)}$ and the result follows.

□

2.2. **Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.** In this subsection we assume that $\kappa > 1$.

Proof. of Theorem 1.1

According to (2.10), we only need to prove that

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}_X^*(H(r))}{(rm)^{1/\kappa}} \underset{r\to+\infty}{\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}}} \mathcal{F}(\kappa, 2(\Gamma(\kappa)\kappa^2 K/m)^{1/\kappa})$$

or, equivalently,

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}_X^*(H(r))}{r^{1/\kappa}} \underset{r\to+\infty}{\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}}} \mathcal{F}(\kappa, 2(\Gamma(\kappa)\kappa^2 K)^{1/\kappa}). \tag{2.20}$$

Now, recall (2.5). Combining it with (2.6) and (2.7), we are left to prove that

$$\forall a > 0,\ \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in[0,r]} Z(x) \le ar^{1/\kappa}\right) \underset{r\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} e^{-2^\kappa\Gamma(\kappa)\kappa^2 K/a^\kappa}. \tag{2.21}$$

According to Proposition 5.1 of [14] we have

$$n(\sup\xi > h) \underset{h\to+\infty}{\sim} Q2^\kappa\Gamma(\kappa)\kappa^2 K/h^\kappa. \tag{2.22}$$

Applying this with $h = ar^{1/\kappa}$ and putting it into Lemma 2.3 we get (2.21) and the convergence of $\mathcal{L}_X^*(t)/t^{1/\kappa}$ follows.

□

Proof. of Theorem 1.2

We now study the asymptotic of the favorite site. We first prove that

$$F^*(H(r))/r \underset{r\to+\infty}{\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}}} \mathcal{U}. \tag{2.23}$$

$\mathcal{L}_X^*(H(r))$ converges in probability to $+\infty$ (because of (2.20)). Therefore, the combination of (2.5), (2.6) and (2.7) tells us that (2.23) will follow if we prove that

$$\mathrm{argmax}_{[0,r]} Z/r \underset{r\to+\infty}{\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}}} \mathcal{U}. \tag{2.24}$$

Let us choose $\gamma \in]0, 1/8\kappa[$. Similarly as in the proof of Lemma 2.3, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{[0,L^{-1}(r/Q-r^{7/8})]} Z_1 > r^{1/\kappa-\gamma}\right) = 1 - e^{-(r/Q-r^{7/8})n(\sup\xi > r^{1/\kappa-\gamma})},$$

and using (2.22) with $h = r^{1/\kappa-\gamma}$, we get that this probability converges to 1 when r goes to infinity :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in[0,L^{-1}(r/Q-r^{7/8})]} Z_1(x) > r^{1/\kappa-\gamma}\right) \underset{r\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1. \tag{2.25}$$

Since $L^{-1}(r/Q - r^{7/8})$ is a stopping time for Z_1 and is such that $Z_1(L^{-1}(r/Q - r^{7/8})) = 1$, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{[L^{-1}(r/Q-r^{7/8}),L^{-1}(r/Q+r^{7/8})]} Z_1 < r^{1/\kappa-\gamma}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{[0,L^{-1}(2r^{7/8})]} Z_1 < r^{1/\kappa-\gamma}\right),$$

and we prove, similarly as for (2.25), that the probability in the right hand side converges to 1. We thus have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{[L^{-1}(r/Q-r^{7/8}),L^{-1}(r/Q+r^{7/8})]} Z_1 < r^{1/\kappa-\gamma}\right) \underset{r\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1. \tag{2.26}$$

Putting (2.25) and (2.26) together, we get that, with a probability converging to 1, $\mathrm{argmax}_{[0,.]}Z_1$ stays constant on $[L^{-1}(r/Q - r^{7/8}), L^{-1}(r/Q + r^{7/8})]$:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\forall x \in [L^{-1}(r/Q - r^{7/8}), L^{-1}(r/Q + r^{7/8})], \mathrm{argmax}_{[0,x]}Z_1 = \mathrm{argmax}_{[0,L^{-1}(r/Q)]}Z_1\right) \underset{r\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1 \tag{2.27}$$

Now, note that, on $\{\tau(Z, 1) < r\}$, we have $\mathrm{argmax}_{[0,r]}Z = \mathrm{argmax}_{[0,r-\tau(Z,1)]}Z_1$. Then, choose $\eta \in]0, 3/4[$. According to (2.13), $\tau(Z, 1) < r^\eta < r$ with a probability converging to 1 and, applying (2.8) we get

$$L^{-1}(r/Q - r^{7/8}) \le L^{-1}((r - r^\eta)/Q - (r - r^\eta)^{3/4}) \le r - r^\eta \le r \le L^{-1}(r/Q + r^{7/8}),$$

with a probability converging to 1. Combining with (2.27) we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{argmax}_{[0,r]}Z = \mathrm{argmax}_{[0,L^{-1}(r/Q)]}Z_1\right) \underset{r\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1. \tag{2.28}$$

Let us denote $\hat{L} := L(\mathrm{argmax}_{[0,L^{-1}(r/Q)]}Z_1)$. Considering the Poisson point process of excursions of Z_1 associated with the local time L, $\hat{L}$ is the instant when occurs the highest excursion before the instant r/Q. It is a well-known property of Poisson point processes that it follows a uniform distribution on $[0, r/Q]$:

$$Q\hat{L}/r \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} \mathcal{U}. \tag{2.29}$$

For the process Z_1, this excursion begins at $L^{-1}(\hat{L}-)$ and ends at $L^{-1}(\hat{L})$ so

$$L^{-1}(\hat{L}-) \le \mathrm{argmax}_{[0,L^{-1}(r/Q)]}Z_1 \le L^{-1}(\hat{L}). \tag{2.30}$$

Then, note that arbitrary high excursions of Z arise if we wait long enough. As a consequence, $L^{-1}(\hat{L}-)$ converges almost surely to $+\infty$ when r goes to infinity. We can thus apply Lemma 2.2 and get that almost surely, for r large enough :

$$Q\hat{L} - \hat{L}^{3/4} \le L^{-1}(\hat{L}-) \le \mathrm{argmax}_{[0,L^{-1}(r/Q)]}Z_1 \le L^{-1}(\hat{L}) \le Q\hat{L} + \hat{L}^{3/4}.$$

Combining with (2.29), we deduce that

$$\mathrm{argmax}_{[0,L^{-1}(r/Q)]} Z_1/r \underset{t\to+\infty}{\overset{\mathcal{L}}{\longrightarrow}} \mathcal{U},$$

and putting it together with (2.28), we get (2.24) and (2.23) follows. We now have to prove the result for the favorite site until a deterministic time, instead of the hitting time $H(r)$. For this, let us choose α as in Lemma 2.1 and $\gamma \in]0,(1-\alpha)/\kappa[$. We prove that, with high probability, the favorite site remains constant between $H(r/m - r^\alpha)$ and $H(r/m + r^\alpha)$, that is,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\forall x \in [H(r/m - r^\alpha), H(r/m + r^\alpha)],\ F^*(x) = F^*(H(r/m))\right) \underset{r\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1. \tag{2.31}$$

First, note that, as a consequence of (2.23),

$$\mathbb{P}\left(F^*(H(r/m - r^\alpha)) \le r/m - 2r^\alpha\right) \underset{r\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1, \tag{2.32}$$

and, as a consequence of (2.20), we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}^*_X(H(r/m - r^\alpha)) > r^{1/\kappa-\gamma}\right) \underset{r\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1. \tag{2.33}$$

Then, since $H(r/m - r^\alpha)$ is a stopping time for the diffusion X we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[H(r/m-r^\alpha),+\infty[} X > r/m - 2r^\alpha\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} X > -r^\alpha\right) \underset{r\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1, \tag{2.34}$$

and using similarly the Markov property together with (2.20), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{[r/m-2r^\alpha, r/m+r^\alpha]} \mathcal{L}_X(H(r/m + r^\alpha), .) \le r^{1/\kappa-\gamma}\right)\\ =&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{[0,3r^\alpha]} \mathcal{L}_X(H(3r^\alpha), .) \le r^{1/\kappa-\gamma}\right) \underset{r\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1.\end{aligned} \tag{2.35}$$

The four estimates (2.32), (2.33), (2.34) and (2.35) tell us that with high probability when r is large, at time $H(r/m - r^\alpha)$, the supremum of the local time has been reached before $r/m - 2r^\alpha$ and is larger than $r^{1/\kappa-\gamma}$, moreover, the diffusion will never reach back $]-\infty, r/m - 2r^\alpha]$, and at time $H(r/m + r^\alpha)$, the supremum of the local time on $[r/m - 2r^\alpha, +\infty[$ is less than $r^{1/\kappa-\gamma}$. As a consequence, with a probability converging to 1, the favorite site does not move between $H(r/m - r^\alpha)$ and $H(r/m + r^\alpha)$, this proves (2.31). Then, (2.31) together with (2.9) give

$$\mathbb{P}\left(F^*(r) = F^*(H(r/m))\right) \underset{r\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1,$$

and this together with (2.23) prove the sought convergence in distribution for the favorite site.

□

3. Path decomposition of a spectrally negative Lévy process

3.1. ***h*-extrema, *h*-valleys and some processes conditioned to stay positive.** Let us recall the notion of h-extrema which was first introduced by Neveu et al. [12], and studied in the case of drifted Brownian motion by Faggionato [9]. For $h > 0$, we say that $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is an h-minimum for V if there exist $u < x < v$ such that $V(y) \wedge V(y-) \ge V(x) \wedge V(x-)$ for all $y \in [u, v]$, $V(u) \ge (V(x) \wedge V(x-)) + h$ and $V(v-) \ge (V(x) \wedge V(x-)) + h$. Moreover, x is an h-maximum for V if x is an h-minimum for $-V$, and x is an h-extremum for V if it is an h-maximum or an h-minimum for V.

Since V is not a compound Poisson process, it is known (see Proposition VI.4, in [3]) that it takes pairwise distinct values in its local extrema. Combining this with the fact that V has almost surely càd-làg paths and drifts to $-\infty$ without being the opposite of a subordinator, we can check that the set of h-extrema is discrete, forms a sequence indexed by $\mathbb{Z}$, unbounded from below and above, and that the h-minima and h-maxima alternate.

We denote respectively by $(m_i,\ i\in\mathbb{Z})$ and $(M_i,\ i\in\mathbb{Z})$ the increasing sequences of h-minima and of h-maxima of V, such that $m_0\le 0<m_1$ and $m_i<M_i<m_{i+1}$ for every $i\in\mathbb{Z}$.

As in [9], we define the *classical h-valleys* as the fragments of the trajectory of V between two h-maxima, translated at the h-minima between them : the i^{th} classical h-valley is the process

$$\Big(V^{(i)}(x),\ M_{i-1}\le x\le M_i\Big)\quad \textit{where}\quad V^{(i)}:=V(x)-V(m_i),\quad \forall x\in\mathbb{R}.$$

In order to state the law of these valleys, we need to recall somme definitions about V and $\hat{V}$ conditioned to stay positive but first, let us recall a useful fact.

Fact 3.1. *Let Y be a spectrally negative Lévy process which is not the opposite of a subordinator, then it is regular for $]0,+\infty[$ and the regularity for $]-\infty,0[$ is equivalent with Y being of unbounded variations.*

Proof. The regularity for $]0,+\infty[$ and the condition for the regularity for $]-\infty,0[$ are stated respectively in Theorem VII.1 and in Corollary VII.5 of [3].

□

V being spectrally negative, the Markov family $(V_x^{\uparrow},x\ge 0)$ may be defined as in [3], Section VII.3. For any $x\ge 0$, the process $V_x^{\uparrow}$ must be seen as V conditioned to stay positive and starting from x. We denote $V^{\uparrow}$ for the process $V_0^{\uparrow}$. It is known that $V_x^{\uparrow}$ converges in the Skorokhod space to $V^{\uparrow}$ when x goes to 0. Also, as well as V, $V^{\uparrow}$ has no positive jumps and reaches every positive level continuously.

According to Fact 3.1, V is regular for $]0,+\infty[$, so $\hat{V}$ is for $]-\infty,0[$. Moreover, $\hat{V}$ drifts to $+\infty$. We can thus define the Markov family $(\hat{V}_x^{\uparrow},\ x\ge 0)$ as in Doney [7], Chapter 8. It can be seen from there that the processes such defined are Markov and have infinite life-time. If moreover V has unbounded variations then $\hat{V}$ is regular for $]0,+\infty[$, and from Theorem 24 of [7], we have that $\hat{V}_0^{\uparrow}$, that we shall denote by $\hat{V}^{\uparrow}$, is well defined.

Here again, for any $x\ge 0$, the process $\hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}$ must be seen as $\hat{V}$ conditioned to stay positive and starting from x. Note that, since $\hat{V}$ converges almost surely to infinity, for $x>0$, $\hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}$ is only $\hat{V}_x$ conditioned in the usual sense to remain positive.

3.2. **Law of the valleys.** We now prove some facts about the law of the consecutive valleys near their bottom. In order to delimit the bottom of the valleys we define

$$\tau_i^-(h):=\sup\{x<m_i,\ V^{(i)}(x)\ge h\},\ \tau_i(h):=\inf\{x>m_i,\ V^{(i)}(x)=h\}.$$

For any $i\in\mathbb{N}^*$, let $P_1^{(i)}$ be the truncated process $(V^{(i)}(m_i-x),\ 0\le x\le m_i-\tau_i^-(h))$, and ${P_2}^{(i)}$ the truncated process $(V^{(i)}(m_i+x),\ 0\le x\le \tau_i(h)-m_i)$. We have,

Proposition 3.2. *(valleys decomposition)*
Assume V has unbounded variations. All the processes of the family $(P_j^{(i)},\ i\ge 1,\ j\in\{1,2\})$, are independent and :

- *For all $i \geq 2$, the law of $P_1^{(i)}$ is absolutely continus with respect to the law of the process $(\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(x))_{0\leq x\leq \tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},h+)}$ and has density $c_h/(1-e^{-\kappa \hat{V}^{\uparrow}(\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},h+))})$ with respect to this law, where c_h is a constant depending on h.*
- *For all $i \geq 1$, $P_2^{(i)}$ is equal in law to $(V^{\uparrow}(x))_{0\leq x\leq \tau(V^{\uparrow},h)}$ (this statement is true even if V has bounded variations).*

Moreover, the density $c_h/(1-e^{-\kappa \hat{V}^{\uparrow}(\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},h+))})$ is bounded by 2 for h deterministically large enough and it converges to 1 when h goes to infinity.

Remark 3.3. *$P_1^{(1)}$ may be a part of the so-called central slope, so its law is different.*

Proof. We assume V has unbounded variations, recall from Fact 3.1 that this implies a regularity condition. In Lemma 4 of Cheliotis [5], the assertion that $\underline{\lim}_{t\to+\infty} X_t = -\infty, \overline{\lim}_{t\to+\infty} X_t = +\infty$ can be dropped. Indeed, because of the regularity condition, the stopping times $\underline{\tau}_k$ and $\overline{\tau}_k$ are almost surely finite. This lemma is therefore true in our context. As a consequence, the proof of Lemma 1 of [5] also applies in our context. We thus get the fact that the slopes are independent and that (except the central slope), all descending (respectively ascending) slopes have the same law.

For the law of the ascending slopes (not covering the origin) until their hitting time of h, we use the classical argument that can be found, for example, in the proof of Theorem 2 in [9] : the law of $P_2^{(i)}$ is the law, before its hitting time of h, of the first excursion higher than h of $V - \underline{V}$, and using Proposition VII.15 of [3] (which does not require V to have unbounded variations), we prove that the latter is the law of $(V^{\uparrow}(x))_{0\leq x\leq \tau(V^{\uparrow},h)}$, that is, $V^{\uparrow}$ killed when hitting h.

Then, by the time-reverse property the descending slopes (not covering the origin) have the same law as the ascending slopes of $\hat{V}$ so, here again, we get that the law of $P_1^{(i)}$ is the law, before its hitting time of $[h, +\infty[$, of the first excursion higher than h of $\hat{V} - \underline{\hat{V}}$. Unfortunately, since $\hat{V}$ is not spectrally negative, we can no longer apply the previous argument to determine the law of the excursion. However, since $]-\infty, 0[$ and $]0, +\infty[$ are regular for $\hat{V}$ (because they are for V) and $\hat{V}$ does not drift to $-\infty$, we can apply Proposition 4.7 of Duquesne [8] but we first need to introduce some notations.

Let $(\hat{L}^{-1}, \hat{I})$ denote the ladder process of $\hat{V}$, of which the definition has been adapted to our setting : $\hat{L}^{-1}$ is the inverse of a local time at 0, denoted by $\hat{L}$, of $\hat{V} - \underline{\hat{V}}$, and for any positive t, $\hat{I}(t) = -\underline{\hat{V}}(\hat{L}^{-1}(t))$. We denote by $\hat{\mathcal{N}}$ the excursion measure of $\hat{V} - \underline{\hat{V}}$ associated with $\hat{L}$, and for ξ an excursion, let $\zeta(\xi) := \inf\{s > 0,\ \xi(s) = 0\}$ denote its life-time.

We denote by $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ the potential measure of $\hat{I}$, and, since $\hat{V}$ is spectrally positive, it can be seen from [3], Section VII.1, that $\hat{\mathcal{I}}([0,x]) = (1-e^{-\kappa x})/\kappa$ for any $x \geq 0$. Proposition 4.7 of [8] tells us that for any measurable function G defined on the space of càd-làg functions from $[0, +\infty[$ to $\mathbb{R}$ with possibly finite life-time, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[G\left((\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(s))_{0\leq s\leq \tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},h+)}\right)\right] &= \hat{\mathcal{N}}\left(G\left((\xi(s))_{0\leq s\leq \tau(\xi,h+)}\right)\hat{\mathcal{I}}([0,\xi(\tau(\xi,h+))[)\middle|\tau(\xi,h+)<\zeta(\xi)\right)\\
&\quad\times\hat{\mathcal{N}}\left(\xi,\tau(\xi,h+)<\zeta(\xi)\right)\\
&= \hat{\mathcal{N}}\left(\frac{(1-e^{-\kappa\xi(\tau(\xi,h+))})}{c_h}G\left((\xi(s))_{0\leq s\leq \tau(\xi,h+)}\right)\middle|\tau(\xi,h+)<\zeta(\xi)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have set $c_h := \kappa/\hat{\mathcal{N}}\left(\xi, \tau(\xi, h+) < \zeta(\xi)\right)$. So, for any measurable function F, we get that

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}}\left(F\left((\xi(s))_{0\le s\le\tau(\xi,h+)}\right)|\tau(\xi,h+)<\zeta(\xi)\right) = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{c_h}{1-e^{-\kappa\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},h+))}}F\left((\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(s))_{0\le s\le\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},h+)}\right)\right].$$

That is, the law of the first excursion higher than h, and killed when reaching $[h,+\infty[$, of the process $\hat{V}-\underline{\hat{V}}$ is absolutely continus with respect to the law of the process $(\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(s))_{0\le s\le\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},h+)}$ and has density $c_h/(1-e^{-\kappa\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},h+))})$ with respect to this law.

For the last assertion of the proposition, note that $c_h = \kappa/\hat{\mathcal{N}}(\xi,\tau(\xi,h+)<\zeta(\xi))$ increases, when h goes to infinity, to $c_\infty := \kappa/\hat{\mathcal{N}}(\xi,\zeta(\xi)=\zeta(\xi))$, where $\hat{\mathcal{N}}(\xi,\zeta(\xi)=+\infty)$ is the measure of infinite excursions above 0 for $\hat{V}-\underline{\hat{V}}$, which is strictly positive, because $\hat{V}$ almost surely converges to infinity. Also, we have almost surely that $\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},h+))\ge h$. Hence, for h deterministically large enough we have

$$c_h/(1-e^{-\kappa\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},h+))})\le 2c_\infty.$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(c_h/(1-e^{-\kappa\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},h+))})\underset{h\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow}c_\infty\right)=1,$$

so by the dominated convergence theorem we get $c_\infty=1$ and the last assertion of the proposition follows. □

3.3. **Standard valleys.** Since V drifts to $-\infty$, the descending phases of V between two h-minima are quite important and have to be taken in consideration for the study of the diffusion in V. Therefore, as in [2], we here define a new sequence $(\tilde{m}_i)_{i\ge1}$ of h-minima that are separated by descending phases of V and we then show that for a large number of indices, this sequence coincides with the sequence $(m_i)_{i\ge1}$ with an overwhelming probability. Our definition of the standard valleys are similar to the one given in [2] but we have to improve it to get a definition more adapted to our context. We first introduce some notations.

$\delta>0$ is defined once and for all in the paper and can be chosen as small as we want. In this subsection h is a fixed positive number such that $e^{(1-\delta)\kappa h}\ge h$. We define $\tilde{\tau}_0(h)=\tilde{L}_0:=0$ and recursively for $i\ge1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{L}_i^{\sharp} &:= \inf\{x>\tilde{L}_{i-1},\ V(x)\le V(\tilde{L}_{i-1})-e^{(1-\delta)\kappa h}\},\\
\tilde{\tau}_i(h) &:= \inf\left\{x\ge\tilde{L}_i^{\sharp},\ V(x)-\inf_{[\tilde{L}_i^{\sharp},x]}V=h\right\},\\
\tilde{m}_i &:= \inf\left\{x\ge\tilde{L}_i^{\sharp},\ V(x)=\inf_{[\tilde{L}_i^{\sharp},\tilde{\tau}_i(h)]}V\right\},\\
\tilde{L}_i &:= \inf\{x>\tilde{\tau}_i(h),\ V(x)\le h/2\},\\
\tilde{\tau}_i^{-}(a) &:= \sup\{x<\tilde{m}_i,\ V(x)-V(\tilde{m}_i)\ge a\},\ \forall a\in[0,h],\\
\tilde{\tau}_i^{+}(a) &:= \inf\{x>\tilde{m}_i,\ V(x)-V(\tilde{m}_i)=a\},\ \forall a\in[0,h].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that all these random variables depend on h, even if this does not appear in the notations. We also introduce the equivalent of $V^{(i)}$ for the $\tilde{m}_i, i\in\mathbb{N}^*$ as follows :

$$\tilde{V}^{(i)}(x):=V(x)-V(\tilde{m}_i),\quad\forall x\in\mathbb{R}.$$

We call i^{th} *standard valley* the re-centered truncated potential $(\tilde{V}^{(i)}(x),\ \tilde{L}_{i-1}\le x\le\tilde{L}_i)$.

Remark 3.4. *The random times $\tilde{L}_i^{\sharp}$, $\tilde{\tau}_i(h)$, and $\tilde{L}_i$ are stopping times. As a consequence, the sequence $(\tilde{V}^{(i)}(x+\tilde{m}_i),\ \tilde{L}_{i-1}-\tilde{m}_i\le x\le\tilde{L}_i-\tilde{m}_i)_{i\ge1}$ is iid.*

Our definitions take in consideration the absence of positive jumps for V, in particular $\tilde{\tau}_i(h) < +\infty$ and $V(\tilde{\tau}_i(h)-) = V(\tilde{\tau}_i(h)) = V(\tilde{m}_i)+h$. We can see that the $\tilde{m}_i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, are h-minima. The next lemma, which is the analogue of Lemma 2.3 in Andreoletti, Devulder [1], shows that, with hight probability, the sequence $(\tilde{m}_i)_{i\geq 1}$ coincides with the sequence $(m_i)_{i\geq 1}$ for indices $i \leq n$ when n does not grow too fast with h.

Lemma 3.5. *For all $n \geq 1$ and h large enough,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{V}_{n,h} := \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \{m_i = \tilde{m}_i\}\right) \geq 1 - ne^{-\delta\kappa h/3}.$$

Proof. As we said before, $\{\tilde{m}_i,\ i \in \mathbb{N}^*\} \subset \{m_i, i \in \mathbb{N}^*\}$. Hence on the complementary $\mathcal{V}^c_{n,h}$ of $\mathcal{V}_{n,h}$, considering the smallest $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $m_i \neq \tilde{m}_i$, we have $m_{i-1} = \tilde{m}_{i-1} < m_i < \tilde{m}_i$.

For this i, we can not have $m_i \in [\tilde{L}^\sharp_i, \tilde{m}_i[$. Indeed, in this case, $m_i - \tilde{L}^\sharp_i$ would be the starting point of an excursion higher than h for $V^{\tilde{L}^\sharp_i} - \underline{V}^{\tilde{L}^\sharp_i}$, but from the definitions, $\tilde{m}_i - \tilde{L}^\sharp_i$ is the starting point of the first excursion higher than h for $V^{\tilde{L}^\sharp_i} - \underline{V}^{\tilde{L}^\sharp_i}$, which contradicts $m_i < \tilde{m}_i$. Hence, $m_i \in]\tilde{m}_{i-1}, \tilde{L}^\sharp_i[$.

$\tilde{m}_{i-1}$ is an h-minimum and there cannot be any h-maximum belonging to $[\tilde{m}_{i-1}, \tilde{\tau}_{i-1}(h)[$ so, as the h minima and the h maxima alternate, necessarily we have $m_i > \tilde{\tau}_{i-1}(h)$, so $m_i \in]\tilde{\tau}_{i-1}(h), \tilde{L}^\sharp_i[$.

Since m_i is an h-minimum, there is $v_i > m_i$ such that $V(m_i) = \inf_{[m_i,v_i]} V$ and $V(v_i) = V(m_i)+h$. Since by definition of $\tilde{L}^\sharp_i$ we have $V(\tilde{L}^\sharp_i) = \inf_{[\tilde{\tau}_{i-1}(h),\tilde{L}^\sharp_i]} V$, we cannot have $\tilde{L}^\sharp_i \in]m_i, v_i]$ so we must have

$$\tilde{\tau}_{i-1}(h) < m_i < v_i < \tilde{L}^\sharp_i.$$

For similar reasons we can neither have $\tilde{L}_{i-1} \in]m_i, v_i]$ so

$$\tilde{\tau}_{i-1}(h) < m_i < v_i < \tilde{L}_{i-1} \quad \text{or} \quad \tilde{L}_{i-1} \leq m_i < v_i < \tilde{L}^\sharp_i.$$

We have proved that

$$\mathcal{V}^c_{n,h} = \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \{m_i = \tilde{m}_i\}\right)^c \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \left(E^1_i \cup E^2_i\right),$$

where

$$E^1_i := \left\{\tau\left(V^{\tilde{\tau}_{i-1}(h)} - \underline{V}^{\tilde{\tau}_{i-1}(h)}, h\right) < \tau\left(\underline{V}^{\tilde{\tau}_{i-1}(h)},]-\infty, -h/2]\right)\right\},$$
$$E^2_i := \left\{\tau\left(V^{\tilde{L}_{i-1}} - \underline{V}^{\tilde{L}_{i-1}}, h\right) < \tau\left(\underline{V}^{\tilde{L}_{i-1}},]-\infty, -e^{(1-\delta)\kappa h}]\right)\right\}.$$

Since $\tilde{\tau}_{i-1}(h)$ and $\tilde{L}_{i-1}$ are stopping times, we get for h large enough :

$$1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \{m_i = \tilde{m}_i\}\right) \leq 2n\mathbb{P}\left(\tau\left(V - \underline{V}, h\right) < \tau\left(\underline{V},]-\infty, -e^{(1-\delta)\kappa h}]\right)\right),$$

and the result follows for h large enough according to Lemma 5.5, applied with $a = h$, $b = e^{(1-\delta)\kappa h}$ and $\eta = \delta/2$.

□

We now make use of the preceding lemma to precise the law of the bottoms of the standard valleys. First, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, let us define

$$\tilde{P}_1^{(i)} := (\tilde{V}^{(i)}(\tilde{m}_i - x),\ 0 \le x \le \tilde{m}_i - \tilde{\tau}_i^-(h)),\ \tilde{P}_2^{(i)} := (\tilde{V}^{(i)}(\tilde{m}_i + x),\ 0 \le x \le \tilde{\tau}_i(h) - \tilde{m}_i),$$
$$\tilde{P}_3^{(i)} := (\tilde{V}^{(i)}(\tilde{\tau}_i(h) + x),\ 0 \le x \le \tilde{L}_i - \tilde{\tau}_i(h)).$$

Note that for any index i, $m_i = \tilde{m}_i$ implies $P_1^{(i)} = \tilde{P}_1^{(i)}$ and $P_2^{(i)} = \tilde{P}_2^{(i)}$.

Proposition 3.6. *Assume V has unbounded variations. All the processes of the family $(\tilde{P}_j^{(i)},\ i \ge 1,\ j \in \{1,2,3\})$, are independent and for all $i \ge 1$,*

$$d_{VT}\left(\tilde{P}_1^{(i)}, P_1^{(2)}\right) \le 2e^{-\delta\kappa h/3}, \qquad \tilde{P}_2^{(i)} \overset{\mathfrak{L}}{=} (V^{\uparrow}(x))_{0\le x\le \tau(V^{\uparrow},h)},$$
$$\tilde{P}_3^{(i)} \overset{\mathfrak{L}}{=} (h + V(x))_{0\le x\le \tau(V,]-\infty,-h/2])}.$$

The statements about the laws of $\tilde{P}_2^{(i)}$ and $\tilde{P}_3^{(i)}$ do not require the hypothesis of unbounded variations. The statements about the laws of $\tilde{P}_1^{(i)}$ is true for h large enough.

Proof. For the independence, we use Remark 3.4, so it only remains to prove that for any $i \ge 1$, $\tilde{P}_1^{(i)}$, $\tilde{P}_2^{(i)}$ and $\tilde{P}_3^{(i)}$ are independent. $\tilde{P}_2^{(i)}$ is, after a stopping time, the first excursion of $V - \underline{V}$ greater than h, considered up to its hitting time of h. It is therefore independent from the previous slopes and, using again Proposition VII.15 of [3] (which does not require V to have unbounded variations), we see that it has the same law as $(V^{\uparrow}(x))_{0\le x\le\tau(V^{\uparrow},h)}$. Also, the Markov property applied at time $\tilde{\tau}_i(h)$ gives the asserted law of $\tilde{P}_3^{(i)}$ and its independence from $(\tilde{P}_1^{(i)}, \tilde{P}_2^{(i)})$.

For the assertion on $\tilde{P}_1^{(i)}$, note that for h large enough, $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{P}_1^{(2)} \ne P_1^{(2)}) \le 2e^{-\delta\kappa h/3}$ according to Lemma 3.5 (applied with $n := 2$) and that for any $i \ge 1$, $\tilde{P}_1^{(i)}$ is equal in law to $\tilde{P}_1^{(2)}$ according to Remark 3.4. The assertion follows.

□

We now consider the first ascend of h from the minimum, after $\tilde{\tau}_i(h)$,

$$\tilde{\tau}_{i+1}^*(h) := \inf\left\{u \ge \tilde{\tau}_i(h),\ V(u) - \inf_{[\tilde{\tau}_i(h),u]} V = h\right\},\ \tilde{m}_{i+1}^* := \inf\left\{u \ge \tilde{\tau}_i(h),\ V(u) = \inf_{[\tilde{\tau}_i(h),\tilde{\tau}_{i+1}^*(h)]} V\right\}.$$

We prove that these coincide with $\tilde{\tau}_{i+1}(h)$ and $\tilde{m}_{i+1}$ with a good probability.

Lemma 3.7. *There is a positive constant c such that for h large enough,*

$$\forall i \ge 1,\ \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{\tau}_i^*(h) = \tilde{\tau}_i(h),\ \tilde{m}_i^* = \tilde{m}_i\right) \ge 1 - e^{-ch}.$$

Proof. Note that $\tilde{m}_i^* = \tilde{m}_i$ whenever $\tilde{\tau}_i^*(h) = \tilde{\tau}_i(h)$. We thus only prove the latter. Fix $i \ge 2$ and recall the definitions of $\tilde{\tau}_i^*(h)$ and $\tilde{\tau}_i(h)$. We have $V(\tilde{L}_i^\sharp) = \inf_{[\tilde{\tau}_{i-1}(h),\tilde{L}_i^\sharp]} V$ so, if $\tilde{L}_i^\sharp < \tilde{\tau}_i^*(h)$, we must have $\tilde{\tau}_i^*(h) = \tilde{\tau}_i(h)$. Therefore,

$$\{\tilde{\tau}_i^*(h) \ne \tilde{\tau}_i(h)\} \subset \left\{\tilde{\tau}_i^*(h) \le \tilde{L}_i^\sharp\right\} = \left\{\tilde{\tau}_i^*(h) \le \tilde{L}_{i-1}\right\} \cup \left\{\tilde{L}_{i-1} < \tilde{\tau}_i^*(h) \le \tilde{L}_i^\sharp\right\}. \tag{3.36}$$

Then, from the Markov property at time $\tilde{\tau}_{i-1}(h)$ and the definitions of $\tilde{L}_{i-1}$ and $\tilde{\tau}_i^*(h)$ we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{\tau}_i^*(h) \le \tilde{L}_{i-1}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V - \underline{V}, h) < \tau(\underline{V},]-\infty, -h/2])\right) \le 2e^{-\kappa h/2}, \tag{3.37}$$

where the last inequality comes from Lemma 5.5 applied with $a = h, b = h/2$ and $\eta = 1/4$. Then, $V(\tilde{L}_{i-1}) = \inf_{[\tilde{\tau}_{i-1}(h),\tilde{L}_{i-1}]} V$ so, if $\tilde{\tau}_i^*(h) > \tilde{L}_{i-1}$ we have $\tilde{\tau}_i^*(h) - \tilde{L}_{i-1} = \tau(V^{\tilde{L}_{i-1}} - \underline{V}^{\tilde{L}_{i-1}}, h)$. Combining this with the definition of $\tilde{L}_i^\sharp$ and the Markov property at time $\tilde{L}_{i-1}$ we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{L}_{i-1} < \tilde{\tau}_i^*(h) \leq \tilde{L}_i^\sharp\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\tau\left(V - \underline{V}, h\right) < \tau\left(\underline{V},]-\infty, -e^{(1-\delta)\kappa h}]\right)\right) \leq e^{-\delta\kappa h/3}, \tag{3.38}$$

where the last inequality is true for h large enough, according to Lemma 5.5 applied with $a = h$, $b = e^{(1-\delta)\kappa h}$ and $\eta = \delta/2$.

Putting together (3.36), (3.37) and (3.38) we get the result when $i \geq 2$. If $i = 1$, (3.36) and (3.38) are true but recall that $\tilde{\tau}_0(h) = \tilde{L}_0 = 0$, so $\{\tilde{\tau}_1^*(h) \leq \tilde{L}_0\} = \emptyset$. The result is therefore also true for $i = 1$.

□

3.4. **Exponential functionals of the bottom of a standard valley.** Let $J(h)$ be the exponential functional of the bottom of the first standard valley :

$$J(h) := \int_{\tau_1^-(h/2)}^{\tau_1^+(h/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(1)}(u)} du.$$

We now make use of Propositions 3.2 and 3.6 and of the existence, proved in [15], of some finite exponential moments for $I(V^\uparrow)$ and $I(\hat{V}^\uparrow)$ to prove a very tight convergence of $J(h)$ to $\mathcal{R}$. This result is crucial in Section 4 where we make $\mathcal{R}$ appear in the limit distribution of the supremum of the local time.

Proposition 3.8. *Assume V has unbounded variations. The family of random variables $(J(h))_{h>0}$ converges in distribution to $\mathcal{R}$ and there exists a positive λ_0 such that*

$$\forall \lambda < \lambda_0, \quad \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda J(h)}\right] \underset{h\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda \mathcal{R}}\right], \tag{3.39}$$

and the above quantities are all finite. As a consequence, the moments of any positive order of $J(h)$ converge to those of $\mathcal{R}$ when h goes to infinity.

Proof. We consider a probability space on which are defined two independent processes Z_1 and Z_2 with $Z_1 \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} \hat{V}^\uparrow$ and $Z_2 \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} V^\uparrow$, and we define

$$\tilde{I}(h) := \int_0^{\tau(Z_1,h/2+)} e^{-Z_1(x)} dx + \int_0^{\tau(Z_2,h/2)} e^{-Z_2(x)} dx, \ \forall h > 0$$
$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}} := \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-Z_1(x)} dx + \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-Z_2(x)} dx.$$

We have trivially the equality in law $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} \mathcal{R}$ and the almost sure increase of the family $(\tilde{I}(h))_{h>0}$ to $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$. Then, from the definitions of $\tilde{P}_1^{(1)}$ and $\tilde{P}_2^{(1)}$,

$$J(h) = \int_0^{\tau(\tilde{P}_1^{(1)},h/2+)} e^{-\tilde{P}_1^{(1)}(u)} du + \int_0^{\tau(\tilde{P}_2^{(1)},h/2)} e^{-\tilde{P}_2^{(1)}(u)} du.$$

According to Proposition 3.6, the two terms are independent and the second is equal in law to the second term of $\tilde{I}(h)$. It is easy to see that, having four random variables A, B, C_A and C_B where A and C_A (respectively B and C_B) are defined on the same probability space and independent, and such that C_A and C_B have the same law, then we have this inequality for the total variation distance :

$$d_{VT}(C_A + A, C_B + B) \leq d_{VT}(A, B).$$

In our case, we thus have

$$d_{VT}\left(J(h),\tilde{I}(h)\right)\leq d_{VT}\left(\int_0^{\tau(\tilde{P}_1^{(1)},h/2+)}e^{-\tilde{P}_1^{(1)}(u)}du,\int_0^{\tau(Z_1,h/2+)}e^{-Z_1(x)}dx\right). \tag{3.40}$$

Then, we see that if A and B are random variables (valued on a metric space E), and f is a mesurable mapping from E to $\mathbb{R}$, we have

$$d_{VT}\left(f(A),f(B)\right)\leq d_{VT}\left(A,B\right).$$

In our case, this yields

$$d_{VT}\left(\int_0^{\tau(\tilde{P}_1^{(1)},h/2+)}e^{-\tilde{P}_1^{(1)}(u)}du,\int_0^{\tau(Z_1,h/2+)}e^{-Z_1(x)}dx\right)\leq d_{VT}\left(\tilde{P}_1^{(1)},(Z_1(x))_{0\leq x\leq\tau(Z_1,h+)}\right) \tag{3.41}$$

From the triangular inequality and Proposition 3.6, we have for h large enough,

$$\begin{aligned}d_{VT}\left(\tilde{P}_1^{(1)},(Z_1(x))_{0\leq x\leq\tau(Z_1,h+)}\right)&\leq d_{VT}\left(\tilde{P}_1^{(1)},P_1^{(2)}\right)+d_{VT}\left(P_1^{(2)},(Z_1(x))_{0\leq x\leq\tau(Z_1,h+)}\right)\\&\leq 2e^{-\delta\kappa h/3}+d_{VT}\left(P_1^{(2)},(Z_1(x))_{0\leq x\leq\tau(Z_1,h+)}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{3.42}$$

Now, using Proposition 3.2, $P_1^{(2)}$ is absolutely continus with respect to the law of the process $(\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(s))_{0\leq s\leq\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},h+)}$ and has density $c_h/(1-e^{-\kappa\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},h+))})$ with respect to this law. It is known that, if a random variable B has a density d_B with respect to a random variable A (both valued in a metric space), then, their total variation distance is expressed as follow :

$$d_{VT}\left(A,B\right)=\frac{1}{2}\int|1-d_B|\,d\mathcal{L}_A.$$

That is, in our case,

$$d_{VT}\left(P_1^{(2)},(Z_1(x))_{0\leq x\leq\tau(Z_1,h+)}\right)=\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|1-\frac{c_h}{1-e^{-\kappa\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},h+))}}\right|\right]. \tag{3.43}$$

Now combining (3.40), (3.41), (3.42) and (3.43) we get for large h,

$$d_{VT}\left(J(h),\tilde{I}(h)\right)\leq 2e^{-\delta\kappa h/3}+\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|1-\frac{c_h}{1-e^{-\kappa\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},h+))}}\right|\right],$$

and because of the last assertion in Proposition 3.2 and dominated convergence, the right-hand-side converges to 0 when h goes to infinity. From this and the convergence of $(\tilde{I}(h))_{h>0}$ to $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ we deduce that $(J(h))_{h>0}$ converges in distribution to $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ (and therefore to $\mathcal{R}$). In order to prove (3.39), it only remain to prove a uniform integrability condition. In particular, (3.39) will follow if we prove the existence of a positive λ_0 and a positive finite constant C such that

$$\forall h>0,\quad \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda_0\tilde{J}(h)}\right]\leq C. \tag{3.44}$$

Thanks to Theorems 1.3 and 1.11 of [15], the positive random variables $I(V^{\uparrow})$ and $I(\hat{V}^{\uparrow})$ admit some finit exponential moments. We can therefore choose a positive λ_0 such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda_0 I(V^{\uparrow})}\right]<+\infty\quad\text{and}\quad\mathbb{E}\left[e^{2\lambda_0 I(\hat{V}^{\uparrow})}\right]<+\infty. \tag{3.45}$$

For any such choice of λ_0 and $h>0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda_0\tilde{J}(h)}\right]=\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda_0\int_0^{\tau(\tilde{P}_1^{(1)},h/2+)}e^{-\tilde{P}_1^{(1)}(u)}du\right)\right]\times\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda_0\int_0^{\tau(\tilde{P}_2^{(1)},h/2)}e^{-\tilde{P}_2^{(1)}(u)}du\right)\right]. \tag{3.46}$$

Then, according to Proposition 3.6,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda_0\int_0^{\tau(\tilde{P}_2^{(1)},h/2)}e^{-\tilde{P}_2^{(1)}(u)}du\right)\right]=\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda_0\int_0^{\tau(V^\uparrow,h/2)}e^{-V^\uparrow(u)}du\right)\right]\leq\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda_0 I(V^\uparrow)}\right] \quad (3.47)$$

From Remark 3.4 and the fact that $(\tilde{m}_i)_{i\geq 1}$ is a subsequence of $(m_i)_{i\geq 1}$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda_0\int_0^{\tau(\tilde{P}_1^{(1)},h/2+)}e^{-\tilde{P}_1^{(1)}(u)}du\right)\right]=\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda_0\int_0^{\tau(\tilde{P}_1^{(2)},h/2+)}e^{-\tilde{P}_1^{(2)}(u)}du\right)\right]\\
=&\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda_0\int_0^{\tau(P_1^{(2)},h/2+)}e^{-P_1^{(2)}(u)}du\right)\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{P}_1^{(2)}=P_1^{(2)}}\right]+\sum_{i>2}\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda_0\int_0^{\tau(P_1^{(i)},h/2+)}e^{-P_1^{(i)}(u)}du\right)\mathbb{1}_{\tilde{P}_1^{(2)}=P_1^{(i)}}\right]\\
\leq&\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda_0\int_0^{\tau(P_1^{(2)},h/2+)}e^{-P_1^{(2)}(u)}du\right)\right]+\sum_{i>2}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(2\lambda_0\int_0^{\tau(P_1^{(i)},h/2+)}e^{-P_1^{(i)}(u)}du\right)\right]}\sqrt{\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{P}_1^{(2)}=P_1^{(i)}\right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, according to Proposition 3.2, the two expectations are (for large h) less than respectively $2\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda_0 I(\hat{V}^\uparrow)}]$ and $2\mathbb{E}[e^{2\lambda_0 I(\hat{V}^\uparrow)}]$. Using the arguments of the proof of Lemma 3.5 we can prove that for h large enough $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{P}_1^{(2)}=P_1^{(i)})\leq e^{-\delta\kappa(i-2)h/3}$. This proves that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\lambda_0\int_0^{\tau(\tilde{P}_1^{(1)},h/2+)}e^{-\tilde{P}_1^{(1)}(u)}du\right)\right]\leq 3\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[e^{2\lambda_0 I(\hat{V}^\uparrow)}\right]}, \quad (3.48)$$

for h large enough. Now, combining (3.46), (3.47), (3.48) and (3.45), we get (3.44) so (3.39) is proved as well.

□

3.5. **Asymptotic of the h-minima sequence.** In this subsection, we are interested in the asymptotic distance between the h-minima when h goes to infinity. This leads to estimates that are useful to study the local time of the diffusion in V outside the bottoms of the valleys, and Theorem 1.4 is also proved in the end of the subsection. First, we define the first ascend of h for $V-\underline{V}$:

$$\tau^*(h):=\inf\{u\geq 0,\ (V-\underline{V})(u)=h\},\ m^*(h):=\inf\{u\geq 0,\ V(u)=\underline{V}(\tau^*(h))\}.$$

Note that, since $\tilde{\tau}_0(h)=0$, $\tau^*(h)$ and $m^*(h)$ coincide with respectively $\tilde{\tau}_1^*(h)$ and $\tilde{m}_1^*$, defined in Subsection 3.3. We study $m^*(h)$ by the mean of excursions theory. Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the space of excursions, that is, càd-làg functions from $[0,+\infty[$ to $\mathbb{R}$, starting at zero and killed at the first positive instant when they reach 0. Note that this instant can possibly be infinite. For $\xi\in\mathcal{F}$, recall the notation $\zeta(\xi):=\inf\{s>0,\ \xi(s)=0\}$ for the length of the excursion ξ. Also, let $\mathcal{F}_{h,-}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{h,+}$ denote respectively the set of excursions which height is strictly less than h and the set of excursions higher than h :

$$\mathcal{F}_{h,-}:=\left\{\xi\in\mathcal{F},\ \sup_{[0,\zeta]}\xi<h\right\},\qquad \mathcal{F}_{h,+}:=\left\{\xi\in\mathcal{F},\ \sup_{[0,\zeta]}\xi\geq h\right\}.$$

With the help of Fact 3.1, we see that $\{0\}$ is instantaneous for $V-\underline{V}$ (and it is regular if and only if V has unbounded variations), excursion theory above 0 can thus be applied for $V-\underline{V}$ (see [3]). Let L be a local time at 0 of $V-\underline{V}$, $\mathcal{N}$ its associated excursion measure and L^{-1} its right continus inverse. Then, the excursions above 0 of $V-\underline{V}$ form a Poisson point process on $\mathcal{F}$ with intensity measure $\mathcal{N}$. In the irregular case (when V has bounded variations) the local time L has to be defined artificially as in [3], Section IV.5. In this case, the excursion measure

is proportional to the law of the first excursion and in particular the total mass of the excursion measure is finite.

Let us define $S^{h,-}$ and $S^{h,+}$ to be two independent pure jumps subordinators with Lévy measure respectively $\zeta\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,-}\cap .)$ and $\zeta\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,+}\cap .)$, the image measures of respectively $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,-}\cap .)$ and $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,+}\cap .)$ by ζ. Since $\zeta\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,-}\cap .)+\zeta\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,+}\cap .)=\zeta\mathcal{N}$, the Lévy-Kintchine representation yields that $S:=S^{h,-}+S^{h,+}$ is a pure jumps subordinator with Lévy measure $\zeta\mathcal{N}$, it is therefore equal in law to L^{-1}.

We also define T_h to be an exponential random variable with parameter $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,+})$, independent from $S^{h,-}$ and $S^{h,+}$. We can now express $m^*(h)$ in term of these objects.

Lemma 3.9.

$$m^*(h)\overset{\mathcal{L}}{=}S^{h,-}(T_h),\quad \textit{and}\quad \tau^*(h)-m^*(h)\overset{\mathcal{L}}{=}\tau(V^{\uparrow},h).$$

Proof. Considering $(e_t)_{t\geq 0}$, the excursion process of $V-\underline{V}$, we have that $L(\tau^*(h))$ is the instant when occurs the first jumps belonging to $\mathcal{F}_{h,+}$, and this jump corresponds to the excursions having $m^*(h)$ as starting point. We can thus write

$$m^*(h)=\sum_{0\leq t\leq L(\tau^*(h))}\zeta(e_t\mathbb{1}_{e_t\in\mathcal{F}_{h,-}}). \tag{3.49}$$

Also, $L(\tau^*(h))$ follows an exponential distribution with parameter $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,+})$ and is independent from the process $(e_t\mathbb{1}_{e_t\in\mathcal{F}_{h,-}})_{t\geq 0}$. By properties of Poisson point processes, the process in the right hand side of (3.49), $\sum_{0\leq t\leq .}\zeta(e_t\mathbb{1}_{e_t\in\mathcal{F}_{h,-}})$, is the sum of the jumps of a Poisson point process on $\mathbb{R}_+$, with intensity measure $\zeta\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,-}\cap .)$. Thus, from the Lévy-Kintchine representation, it has the same law as the subordinator $S^{h,-}$, which yields the result for $m^*(h)$.

Then, $(V(x)-V(m^*(h)),\ 0\leq x\leq\tau^*(h)-m^*(h))$ is, considered up to its hitting time of h, the first excursion higher than h of $V-\underline{V}$. As we sais in the proof of Propositions 3.2 and 3.6, the latter is equal in law to $(V^{\uparrow}(x))_{0\leq x\leq\tau(V^{\uparrow},h)}$. The result about $\tau^*(h)-m^*(h)$ follows.

□

We are now left to study S and $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,+})$, the parameter of T_h. For S, we have the following lemma :

Lemma 3.10. *The random variable $L^{-1}(1)$ (or equivalently $S(1)$) admits some finite exponential moments.*

Proof. The proof shares some ideas with the one given for Lemma 3.5 of [15]. We fix an arbitrary $t>1$. $\mathcal{N}\left(\xi\in\mathcal{F},\ \zeta(\xi)>t\right)$ is equal to

$$\mathcal{N}\left(\xi\in\mathcal{F},\ \zeta(\xi)>t,\ \tau(\xi,1)\leq 1\right)+\mathcal{N}\left(\xi\in\mathcal{F},\ \zeta(\xi)>t,\ \tau(\xi,1)>1\right). \tag{3.50}$$

The first term is less than

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{N}\left(\xi\in\mathcal{F},\ \tau(\xi,1)<+\infty,\ \inf\{s\geq 0,\ \xi(\tau(\xi,1)+s)=0\}>t-1\right)\\
=&\mathcal{N}\left(\xi\in\mathcal{F},\ \tau(\xi,1)<+\infty\right)\times\mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V_1,]-\infty,0])>t-1\right)\\
\leq&\mathcal{N}\left(\xi\in\mathcal{F},\ \tau(\xi,1)<+\infty\right)\times\mathbb{P}\left(V(t-1)>-1\right)\\
\leq&\mathcal{N}\left(\xi\in\mathcal{F},\ \tau(\xi,1)<+\infty\right)\times e^{\lambda}\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda V(t-1)}\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the Markov property in the excursions, chose some $\lambda\in]0,\kappa[$ and used Markov's inequality. We thus get that $\mathcal{N}(\xi\in\mathcal{F},\ \zeta(\xi)>t,\ \tau(\xi,1)\leq 1)$ is less than

$$\mathcal{N}\left(\xi\in\mathcal{F},\ \tau(\xi,1)<+\infty\right)\times e^{\lambda}\times e^{(t-1)\Psi_V(\lambda)}, \tag{3.51}$$

and $\Psi_V(\lambda) < 0$ since $\lambda \in]0, \kappa[$. Then, the second term of (3.50) is less than

$$\int_0^1 \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V_z,]-\infty, 0]) > t-1\right) \times \mathcal{N}\left(\zeta(\xi) > 1,\ \xi(1) \in dz\right),$$

where we used the Markov property at time 1 in the excursions,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \int_0^1 \mathbb{P}\left(V(t-1) > -z\right) \times \mathcal{N}\left(\zeta(\xi) > 1,\ \xi(1) \in dz\right) \\
&\leq \int_0^1 \mathbb{P}\left(V(t-1) > -1\right) \times \mathcal{N}\left(\zeta(\xi) > 1,\ \xi(1) \in dz\right) \\
&\leq \mathcal{N}\left(\zeta(\xi) > 1\right) \times e^{\lambda} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda V(t-1)}\right],
\end{aligned}$$

for the same $\lambda \in]0, \kappa[$ and again we used Markov's inequality. We thus get that $\mathcal{N}(\xi \in \mathcal{F},\ \zeta(\xi) > t,\ \tau(\xi, 1) > 1)$ is less than

$$\mathcal{N}\left(\xi \in \mathcal{F},\ \zeta(\xi) > 1\right) \times e^{\lambda} \times e^{(t-1)\Psi_V(\lambda)}. \tag{3.52}$$

Now putting (3.51) and (3.52) in (3.50), we get the existence of positive constants c_1, c_2 such that

$$\forall t > 1,\ \mathcal{N}\left(\xi \in \mathcal{F},\ \zeta(\xi) > t\right) \leq c_1 e^{-c_2 t}$$

which proves that for some $c > 0$,

$$\int_1^{+\infty} e^{c\zeta(x)} \mathcal{N}(dx) < +\infty.$$

Using Theorem 25.3 in Sato [13], we deduce that $L^{-1}(1)$ admits some finite exponential moments.

□

The next lemma deals with the asymptotic behavior of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,+})$.

Lemma 3.11.

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,+}) = e^{-\kappa h} \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{1,+}) \times \left(e^{\kappa} - \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\kappa V_1(\tau(V_1,]-\infty, 0]))}\right]\right) + \mathcal{O}(e^{-2\kappa h}).$$

Proof. We fix $h > 1$. From the strong Markov property applied at the hitting time of 1 in the excursions belonging to $\mathcal{F}_{1,+}$ we get

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,+}) / \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{1,+}) = \mathbb{P}\left(\tau\left(V_1, h\right) < \tau\left(V_1,]-\infty, 0]\right)\right) =: p_h. \tag{3.53}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{-\kappa(h-1)} &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{[0,+\infty[} V_1 > h\right) \\
&= p_h + \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V_1,]-\infty, 0]) < \tau(V_1, h),\ \sup_{[0,+\infty[} V_1(\tau(V_1,]-\infty, 0]) + .) > h\right) \\
&= p_h + \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\kappa(h - V_1(\tau(V_1,]-\infty, 0])))} \mathbb{1}_{\tau(V_1,]-\infty, 0]) < \tau(V_1, h)}\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the strong Markov property at the stopping time $\tau(V_1,]-\infty, 0])$. We get

$$\begin{aligned}
p_h &= e^{-\kappa h}\left(e^{\kappa} - \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\kappa V_1(\tau(V_1,]-\infty, 0]))} \mathbb{1}_{\tau(V_1,]-\infty, 0]) < \tau(V_1, h)}\right]\right) \\
&= e^{-\kappa h}\left(e^{\kappa} - \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\kappa V_1(\tau(V_1,]-\infty, 0]))}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\kappa V_1(\tau(V_1,]-\infty, 0]))} \mathbb{1}_{\tau(V_1,]-\infty, 0]) > \tau(V_1, h)}\right]\right).
\end{aligned}$$

According to (3.53), it only remains to bound the last term. Since $e^{\kappa V_1(\tau(V_1,]-\infty,0]))}$ is almost surely less than 1 we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\kappa V_1(\tau(V_1,]-\infty,0]))}\mathbb{1}_{\tau(V_1,]-\infty,0])>\tau(V_1,h)}\right] \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V_1,h) <= +\infty\right) = e^{-\kappa(h-1)},$$

and the result follows.

□

We can now get the asymptotic behavior of $m^*(h)$.

Proposition 3.12.

$$e^{-\kappa h}\ m^*(h) \xrightarrow[h\to+\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{E}(q),$$

where $\mathcal{E}(q)$ is the exponential distribution of parameter

$$q := \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{1,+}) \times (e^{\kappa} - \mathbb{E}[e^{\kappa V_1(\tau(V_1,]-\infty,0]))}])/\int_0^{+\infty} \zeta(x)\mathcal{N}(dx).$$

The parameter q here is the one appearing in Theorem 1.4. If $V = W_\kappa$, the κ-drifted brownian motion, the calculations can be made more explicit. Using (2.7) of [9], we can prove that the parameter q in the above proposition (which is the same q as in Theorem 1.4) equals $\kappa^2/2$.

Proof. of Proposition 3.12

Thanks to Lemma 3.9, we are reduced to study $S^{h,-}(T_h)$. We have

$$\frac{S^{h,-}(T_h)}{T_h} = \frac{S(T_h)}{T_h} - \frac{S^{h,+}(T_h)}{T_h} \tag{3.54}$$

According to Lemma 3.11, $\mathbb{P}(T_h > M)$ converges to 1 when h goes to infinity, for any $M > 0$. According to Lemma 3.10, $S(1)$ has finite expectation so we can use the law of large number for Lévy processes (see for example Theorem 36.5 in [13]) and deduce that $S(t)/t$ converges almost surely (and therefore in distribution) to $\mathbb{E}[S(1)]$. We deduce that

$$S(T_h)/T_h \xrightarrow[h\to+\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathbb{E}[S(1)]. \tag{3.55}$$

We now deal with the second term of the right hand side of (3.54). From the independence between $S^{h,+}$ and T_h we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[S^{h,+}(T_h)/T_h\right] = \int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[S^{h,+}(u)/u\right] \mathcal{L}_{T_h}(du) = \mathbb{E}\left[S^{h,+}(1)\right].$$

Then, $\zeta\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,+} \cap .)$, the Lévy measure of $S^{h,+}$, converges to 0 when h goes to infinity. Since $S^{h,+}$ is pure jump, we deduce that $S^{h,+}(1)$ converges to 0 in probability when h goes to infinity. Then, $S^{h,+}(1) \leq S(1)$ and $S(1)$ has finite expectation, so we deduce by dominated converges that $\mathbb{E}[S^{h,+}(1)]$ converges to 0, we thus get

$$S^{h,+}(T_h)/T_h \xrightarrow[h\to+\infty]{\mathcal{L}} 0. \tag{3.56}$$

Combining (3.54), (3.55) and (3.56) we get

$$S^{h,-}(T_h)/T_h \xrightarrow[h\to+\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathbb{E}[S(1)]. \tag{3.57}$$

Recall also that $\mathbb{E}[S(1)] = \mathbb{E}[L^{-1}(1)] = \int_0^{+\infty} x\ \zeta\mathcal{N}(dx)$. Then,

$$e^{-\kappa h} S^{h,-}(T_h) = (e^{-\kappa h}/\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,+})) \times (\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,+}) \times T_h) \times (S^{h,-}(T_h)/T_h),$$

so combining Lemma 3.11, the definition of T_h, (3.57) and Slutsky Lemma, we get that $e^{-\kappa h}S^{h,-}(T_h)$ converges to an exponential distribution with parameter $q := \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{1,+}) \times (e^{\kappa} - \mathbb{E}[e^{\kappa V_1(\tau(V_1,]-\infty,0]))}])/\int_0^{+\infty}\zeta(x)\mathcal{N}(dx)$. Thanks to Lemma 3.9 we get the result.

□

We can now prove Theorem 1.4.

Proof. of Theorem 1.4

As we said in the proof of Proposition 3.2, Lemma 1 of [5] applies here, so the random variables $(m_{i+1} - m_i)_{i\geq 1}$ are *iid*, and m_1 is also independent from this sequence. To prove Theorem 1.4, we thus only need to prove that the random variables $e^{-\kappa h}m_1$ and $e^{-\kappa h}(m_2 - m_1)$ converge in distribution to an exponential distribution with parameter q. Then, note that according to Lemma 3.5 applied with $n := 2$, we only need to prove this convergence for $e^{-\kappa h}\tilde{m}_1$ and $e^{-\kappa h}(\tilde{m}_2 - \tilde{m}_1)$. Now, according to subsection 3.3,

$$\tilde{m}_2 - \tilde{m}_1 = (\tilde{\tau}_1(h) - \tilde{m}_1) + (\tilde{L}_1 - \tilde{\tau}_1(h)) + (\tilde{L}_2^\sharp - \tilde{L}_1) + (\tilde{m}_2 - \tilde{L}_2^\sharp),$$

and according to Proposition 3.6 for the first term and the Markov property at times $\tilde{\tau}_1(h)$, $\tilde{L}_1$ and $\tilde{L}_2^\sharp$ for the other terms, we get that the terms on the right hand side have respectively the same law as $\tau(V^\uparrow, h)$, $\tau(V,]-\infty, -h/2])$, $\tau(V,]-\infty, -e^{(1-\delta)\kappa h}])$, and $m^*(h)$. Now, using Lemma 5.6 for the first term, and Lemma 5.4 for the second and third terms, we get that these terms, renormalized by $e^{-\kappa h}$ converge to 0 when h goes to infinity. Proposition 3.12 gives the convergence for the last term renormalized by $e^{-\kappa h}$. Combining with Slutsky Lemma we get that $e^{-\kappa h}(\tilde{m}_2 - \tilde{m}_1)$ converge in distribution to an exponential distribution with parameter q.

For $\tilde{m}_1$ it is even simpler, we have $\tilde{m}_1 = \tilde{L}_1^\sharp + (\tilde{m}_1 - \tilde{L}_1^\sharp)$, so we can conclude the same way.

□

4. Supremum of the local time when $0 < \kappa < 1$

We now generalize, in the context of the diffusion in V, the arguments of [2] to prove the convergence of the supremum of the local time when $0 < \kappa < 1$. First, let us recall some definitions of [1] and [2] for the study of the diffusion across the valleys.

The diffusions moves across valleys, and for these to be neither too small or too large with respect to the time scale, we have to make the size of the valleys grow with time t. We are thus interested in h_t-valleys where

$$h_t := \log(t) - \phi(t), \text{ for some function } \phi \text{ with } \log(\log(t)) << \phi(t) << \log(t).$$

We also define N_t, the indice of the largest h_t-minima visited by X until time t,

$$N_t := \max\left\{k \in \mathbb{N}, \sup_{0\leq s\leq t} X(s) \geq m_k\right\}.$$

We need our estimates on the valleys to be true simultaneously for a large deterministic number of valleys that we will prove to be greater than N_t with good probability. This is why we define $n_t := \lfloor e^{\kappa(1+\delta)\phi(t)}\rfloor$.

In all this section, we assume that δ is small enough so that $(1 + 3\delta)\kappa < 1$, and that the hypothesis of Theorem 1.3 are satisfied : V has unbounded variations and there exists $p > 1$ such that $V(1) \in L^p$, so all the results of Sections 3 and 5 apply here.

4.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.3.** As in [2], the idea is to approximate $\mathcal{L}^*_X(t)/t$ by a functional of a sequence $(e_iS^t_i, e_iS^t_iR^t_i)_{i\geq 1}$ that is defined later. Our approximation is similar to Proposition 5.1 of [2] and can be stated as follows :

Proposition 4.1. *Let us define the repartition functions*

$$\mathcal{P}_1^{\pm}(\alpha) := \mathbb{P}\left(\left(1-\frac{1}{t}\sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}_{t(1-\eta)}} e_iS^t_iR^t_i\right)\frac{e_{\mathcal{N}_{t(1-\eta)}}S^t_{\mathcal{N}_{t(1-\eta)}}}{e_{\mathcal{N}_{t(1-\eta)}}S^t_{\mathcal{N}_{t(1-\eta)}}R^t_{\mathcal{N}_{t(1-\eta)}}} \leq \alpha_t^{\pm}, \max_{1\leq i\leq \mathcal{N}_{t(1-\eta)}-1}\frac{e_iS^t_i}{t}\leq \alpha_t^{\pm}\right),$$

where $\alpha_t^{\pm} := \alpha(1\pm(\log\log t)^{-1/2})$. *Let also* v *be a positive function such that* $\lim_{\eta\to 0}\lim_{t\to+\infty} v(\eta,t)=0$. *For all* t *large enough we then have*

$$\mathcal{P}_1^-(\alpha) - v(\eta,t) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}\mathcal{L}_X(t,x)/t\leq\alpha\right)\leq \mathcal{P}_1^+(\alpha)+v(\eta,t).$$

The next step is to identify the objects in $\mathcal{P}_1^{\pm}(\alpha)$ as continus functionals of something that converges to $(\mathcal{Y}_1,\mathcal{Y}_2)$ (defined in the Introduction) when t goes to infinity. Let $(D([0,+\infty[,\mathbb{R}^2),J_1)$ be the space of càd-làg functions taking values in $\mathbb{R}^2$, equipped with the J_1-Skorokhod topology. If, as in [2], we define $(Y_1,Y_2)^t$ by

$$\forall s\geq 0,\ (Y_1,Y_2)^t(s) := \frac{1}{t}\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor se^{\kappa\phi(t)}\rfloor}(e_jS^t_j, e_jS^t_jR^t_j),$$

then we have

Proposition 4.2. $(Y_1,Y_2)^t$ *converges in distribution to* $(\mathcal{Y}_1,\mathcal{Y}_2)$ *in* $(D([0,+\infty[,\mathbb{R}^2),J_1)$.

The objects in $\mathcal{P}_1^{\pm}(\alpha)$ can be written in term of functionals of $(Y_1,Y_2)^t$: the functionals $J^-_{I,a}$, $K_{I,a}$, $K^-_{I,a}$, $\tilde{K}_{I,a}$ and $\tilde{K}^-_{I,a}$ (with $a=1-\eta$) defined in Subsection 4.3 of [2]. Thanks to Lemma 4.5 there, we see that the κ-stable subordinator $(\mathcal{Y}_1,\mathcal{Y}_2)$ is almost surely a point of continuity for these functionals so, by *continus mapping theorem* and Proposition 4.2, we get, when t goes to infinity, the convergence of $\mathcal{P}_1^{\pm}(\alpha)$ to

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max\left\{\mathcal{Y}_1^{\natural}(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\eta)-),\ (1-\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\eta)-))\frac{\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\eta))-\mathcal{Y}_1(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\eta)-)}{\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\eta))-\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\eta)-)}\right\}\leq\alpha\right).$$

Then, we have almost surely $\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\eta)=\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)$ for all η small enough (since almost surely $\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)-)<1$). As a consequence, when η goes to 0, the above expression converges to the repartition function of the random variable $\mathcal{I}_1\vee\mathcal{I}_2$ (defined in the Introduction) at α.

As a consequence, Theorem 1.3 follows if we prove Propositions 4.1 and 4.2. For Proposition 4.1, we first need to show that the time spent by the diffusion and the local time are negligible outside the bottoms of the standard valleys, this is the object of the next two facts that are taken from [1] and [2] (however, the extension of these results to our context requires some precautions, this is why we give some details in the end of Section 5).

Fact 4.3. *There exists a positive constant* $C>0$ *such that for* t *large enough,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{A}^1_t := \bigcap_{j=1}^{n_t}\left\{0\leq H(\tilde{m}_j)-\sum_{i=1}^{j-1}\left(H(\tilde{L}_i)-H(\tilde{m}_i)\right)\leq\frac{2t}{\log h_t}\right\}\right)\geq 1-Ce^{-\phi(t)}n_t\log h_t.$$

The lower bound converges to 1 *since* $(1+2\delta)\kappa<1$.

Before stating the next fact, which proves that the supremum of the local time is negligible outside the "deep bottoms" of the standard valleys, we need to define what we mean exactly by "deep bottom". We define

$$\mathcal{D}_j := [\tilde{\tau}_j^-((\phi(t))^2), \tilde{\tau}_j^+((\phi(t))^2)].$$

Note that the definition we give is different from the one in [2]. Indeed, the presence of negative jumps for the environment in our context implies to take some precautions and to adapt some definitions.

Fact 4.4. *Recall the definitions of $\tau^*(h)$ and $m^*(h)$ in Subsection 3.5. There are positive constants C_1, C_2, C_3 such that for t large enough,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in[0,m^*(h_t)]} \mathcal{L}_X(H(\tau^*(h_t)),x) > te^{(\kappa(1+3\delta)-1)\phi(t)}\right) \leq \frac{C_1}{n_t e^{\kappa\delta\phi(t)}}, \tag{4.58}$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=0}^{n_t-1}\left\{\sup_{\mathbb{R}}\left(\mathcal{L}_X(H(\tilde{m}_{j+1}),x)-\mathcal{L}_X(H(\tilde{L}_j),x)\right) \leq te^{(\kappa(1+3\delta)-1)\phi(t)}\right\}\right) \geq 1-\frac{C_2}{e^{\kappa\delta\phi(t)}}, \tag{4.59}$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{n_t}\left\{\sup_{x\in[\tilde{L}_{j-1},\tilde{L}_j]\cap\mathcal{D}_j^c}\left(\mathcal{L}_X(H(\tilde{L}_j),x)-\mathcal{L}_X(H(\tilde{m}_j),x)\right) \leq te^{-2\phi(t)},\right\}\right) \geq 1-\frac{C_3 n_t}{e^{2\phi(t)}}. \tag{4.60}$$

The next step in the proof of Proposition 4.1 is to show that the main contributions to the local time and to the time spent by the diffusion in the bottoms of the standard valleys can be approximated by the sequence $(e_iS_i^t, e_iS_i^tR_i^t)_{i\geq 1}$:

Proposition 4.5. *The random variables e_j, S_j^t, R_j^t, $j\geq 1$ are mutually independent and for any $\epsilon \in]0, \max(1/8,(1-(1+\delta)\kappa)/2)[$ there exists a positive constant c such that for t large enough,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{A}_t^2 := \cap_{j=1}^{n_t}\left\{(1-e^{-\epsilon h_t/7})e_jS_j^t \leq \mathcal{L}_X(H(\tilde{L}_j),\tilde{m}_j) \leq (1+e^{-\epsilon h_t/7})e_jS_j^t\right\}\right) \geq 1-e^{-ch_t},$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{A}_t^3 := \cap_{j=1}^{n_t}\left\{(1-e^{-\epsilon h_t/7})e_jS_j^tR_j^t \leq H(\tilde{L}_j)-H(\tilde{m}_j) \leq (1+e^{-\epsilon h_t/7})e_jS_j^tR_j^t\right\}\right) \geq 1-e^{-ch_t}.$$

This proposition is proved in the following subsection. For the end of the proof of Proposition 4.1, the idea is simply to use the previous steps to translate "$\mathcal{L}_X^*(t)/t \leq \alpha$" in term of events only involving the sequence $(e_iS_i^t, e_iS_i^tR_i^t)_{i\geq 1}$. We do this in Subsection 4.3, following the arguments of the proof of Proposition 5.1 of [2].

Finally, Proposition 4.2 is roughly speaking a Donsker Theorem for heavy tailed random variables, its proof relies on the study of the right tail of the random variables $e_1S_1^t$ and $e_1S_1^tR_1^t$ which is done in subsection 4.4.

4.2. **Proof of Proposition 4.5 and consequences.** We now prove that $(\mathcal{L}_X(H(\tilde{L}_j),\tilde{m}_j), H(\tilde{L}_j)-H(\tilde{m}_j))_{j\geq 1}$ can be approximated by an *iid* sequence. This generalizes Proposition 3.5 of [2] to our setting.

First, note that the proof of the first point of Lemma 3.6 in [2] can be repeated here. We only replace W_κ by V, consider the standard valleys to be defined in our sens, replace the random times $\tilde{L}_j^-$ of [2] by $\tilde{L}_{j-1}$, apply Lemma 5.21 for the first n_t indices instead of Lemma 3.2 of [1], and use Remark 3.4 instead of Lemma 2.2 of [2]. We get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left(\mathcal{L}_X(H(\tilde{L}_j),\tilde{m}_j), H(\tilde{L}_j)-H(\tilde{m}_j)\right)_{1\leq j\leq n_t} = \left(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j,\tilde{h}_j\right)_{1\leq j\leq n_t}\right) \geq 1-n_te^{-\kappa\delta h_t/6}, \tag{4.61}$$

where the sequence $(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j, \tilde{h}_j)_{j\geq 1}$ is *iid* and $(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j, \tilde{h}_j)$ is equal to

$$A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \times \left(\mathcal{L}_{B^j}(\tau(B^j,1),0), \int_{\tilde{L}_{j-1}}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} \mathcal{L}_{B^j}\left(\tau(B^j,1), A^j(u)/A^j(\tilde{L}_1)\right) du \right), \tag{4.62}$$

where $A^j(u) := \int_{\tilde{m}_j}^u e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(x)} dx$ and B^j is a sequence of *iid* brownian motions starting at 0, and independent from V. Note that $e_j := \mathcal{L}_X(H(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j)/A^j(\tilde{L}_j) = \mathcal{L}_{B^j}(\tau(B^j,1),0)$ follows an exponential distribution with parameter $1/2$. We are thus left to give approximations of $\tilde{h}_j$ and $A^j(\tilde{L}_j)$. For this, we first prove lemmas to bound exponential functionals of the environment.

Lemma 4.6. *Choose ϵ such that $0 < \epsilon < \max(1/8, (1-(1+\delta)\kappa)/2)$. Then,*

$$\forall j \geq 1,\ \mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{L}_{j-1}}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du > e^{-\epsilon h_t} \right) \leq e^{-ch_t},$$

for t large enough and some positive constant c depending on δ and ϵ.

Proof. Fix $j \geq 1$. We have

$$\int_{\tilde{L}_{j-1}}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du = \int_{\tilde{L}_{j-1}}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du + \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t)}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du. \tag{4.63}$$

The first term of the right hand side is less than

$$\left(\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t) - \tilde{L}_{j-1}\right) \times \sup_{[\tilde{L}_{j-1}, \tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t)]} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}}.$$

According to Lemma 5.17 for the first factor, and the definition of $\tilde{L}_j^\sharp$ together with Lemma 5.16 applied with $\alpha = 1, \eta = \epsilon$ for the second factor, there is a positive constant c_1 (depending on δ and ϵ) such that for t large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{L}_{j-1}}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du > e^{-\epsilon h_t}/2 > e^{((1+\delta)\kappa+\epsilon-1)h_t} \right) \leq e^{-c_1 h_t}. \tag{4.64}$$

According to Propositions 3.6 and 3.2 we have,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t)}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du > e^{-\epsilon h_t}/2 \right) \leq 2\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tau(\hat{V}^\uparrow, [h_t/2, +\infty[)}^{\tau(\hat{V}^\uparrow, [h_t, +\infty[)} e^{-\hat{V}^\uparrow(u)} du > e^{-\epsilon h_t}/2 \right) + 2e^{-\delta\kappa h_t/3},$$

and the integral on the right hand side is less than

$$\tau\left(\hat{V}^\uparrow, [h_t, +\infty[\right) \times \sup_{[\tau(\hat{V}^\uparrow, [h_t/2, +\infty[), \tau(\hat{V}^\uparrow, [h_t, +\infty[)]} e^{-\hat{V}^\uparrow}.$$

Then, according to Lemma 5.11 applied with $y = h_t$, $r = e^{h_t/8}$ and Lemma 5.9 applied with $a = h_t/4, b = h_t/2$, $z = 0$, there is a positive constant c_2 such that for t large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t)}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du > e^{-\epsilon h_t}/2 > e^{(1/8-1/4)h_t} \right) \leq e^{-c_2 h_t}. \tag{4.65}$$

The combination of (4.63), (4.64) and (4.65) yields the result.

□

Lemma 4.7. *Choose ϵ such that $0 < \epsilon < 1/8$. There is a positive constant c such that for t large enough,*

$$\forall j \geq 1,\ \mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)}du > e^{-\epsilon h_t}\right) \leq e^{-ch_t}.$$

Proof. Fix $j \geq 1$. We have

$$\int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)}du = \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{\tau}_j(h_t)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)}du + \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j(h_t)}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)}du. \tag{4.66}$$

According to Proposition 3.6, the fist term on the right hand side is equal in law to $\int_{\tau(V^\uparrow,h_t/2)}^{\tau(V^\uparrow,h_t)} e^{-V^\uparrow(u)}du$ which is less than

$$\tau(V^\uparrow,h_t) \times \sup_{[\tau(V^\uparrow,h_t/2),\tau(V^\uparrow,h_t)]} e^{-V^\uparrow}.$$

According, for the first factor, to Lemma 5.6 applied with $y = h_t, r = e^{h_t/8}$ and, for the second factor, to Lemma 5.7 applied with $a = h_t/4, b = h_t/2$, there is a positive constant c_1 such that for t large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{\tau}_j(h_t)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)}du > e^{-\epsilon h_t}/2 > e^{(1/8-1/4)h_t}\right) \leq e^{-c_1 h_t}. \tag{4.67}$$

Because of the definition of $\tilde{L}_j$, the second term in the right hand side of (4.66) is less than $e^{-h_t/2}(\tilde{L}_j - \tilde{\tau}_j(h_t))$. Because of Proposition 3.6, $\tilde{L}_j - \tilde{\tau}_j(h_t)$ is equal in law to $\tau(V,]-\infty,-h_t/2])$. Applying Lemma 5.4 with $y = h_t/2$ and $r = e^{h_t/4}$ we get, for t large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{\tau}_j(h_t)}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)}du > e^{-\epsilon h_t}/2 > e^{(1/4-1/2)h_t}\right) \leq e^{-h_t}. \tag{4.68}$$

The combination of (4.66), (4.67) and (4.68) yields the result.

□

Lemma 4.8. *Choose ϵ such that $0 < \epsilon < 1/4$. There is a positive constant c (depending on ϵ) such that for t large enough,*

$$\forall j \geq 1,\ \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u\in[\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2),\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)]} \left|A^j(u)/A^j(\tilde{L}_j)\right| \leq e^{-(1-2\epsilon)h_t/2}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-ch_t}.$$

Proof. We have

$$A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \geq \int_{\tilde{m}_j}^{\tilde{\tau}_j(h_t)} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)}du \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} \int_0^{\tau(V^\uparrow,h_t)} e^{V^\uparrow(u)}du \quad \text{and} \quad A^j(\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)) \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} \int_0^{\tau(V^\uparrow,h_t/2)} e^{V^\uparrow(u)}du$$

where we used Proposition 3.6 for the equalities in law. For $A^j(\tilde{L}_j)$ we use (5.99) applied with $h = h_t$, $\eta = \epsilon/2$ and for $A^j(\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2))$ we use (5.100) applied with $h = h_t/2$, $\eta = \epsilon$. We get the existence of a positive constant c_1 such that for t large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(0 \leq A^j(\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2))/A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \leq e^{-(1-2\epsilon)h_t/2}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-c_1 h_t}. \tag{4.69}$$

Then, $A^j(\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)) = \int_{\tilde{m}_j}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)}du$ and according to Propositions 3.6 and 3.2 we have,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(A^j(\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)) \le -e^{h_t(1+\epsilon)/2}\right) \le 2\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{\tau(\hat{V}^\uparrow, h_t/2+)} e^{\hat{V}^\uparrow(u)}du \ge e^{h_t(1+\epsilon)/2}\right) + 2e^{-\delta\kappa h_t/3}$$
$$\le 2e^{-c_4 h_t} + 2e^{-\delta\kappa h_t/3},$$

where the last inequality is true for c_4 a positive constant and t large enough. It comes from (5.105) applied with $h = h_t/2$, $\eta = \epsilon$. Now combining with the lower bound for $A^j(\tilde{L}_j)$ (given by (5.99) applied with $h = h_t$, $\eta = \epsilon/2$) we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(-e^{-h_t(1-2\epsilon)/2} \le A^j(\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2))/A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \le 0\right) \ge 1 - e^{-c_5 h_t}, \tag{4.70}$$

for some positive constant c_5, and when t is large enough. The combination of (4.69) and (4.70) with the increase of $A^j(.)$ yields the result.

□

We now approximate $\tilde{h}_j$.

Lemma 4.9. *Choose ϵ such that $0 < \epsilon < \max(1/8, (1-(1+\delta)\kappa)/2)$. There is a positive constant c (depending on δ and ϵ) such that for all t large enough we have*

$$\forall j \ge 1,\ \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\tilde{h}_j - A^j(\tilde{L}_j)R_j^t e_j\right| \le e^{-\epsilon h_t/6} A^j(\tilde{L}_j)R_j^t e_j\right) \ge 1 - e^{-ch_t}, \tag{4.71}$$

where

$$R_j^t := \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)}\mathrm{d}u.$$

Proof. Our proof has the same spirit as the one of Lemma 4.7 of [1] but relies on our estimates. We give the details. Here again, $\tilde{h}_j/A^j(\tilde{L}_j)$ can be cut into three parts :

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{h}_j/A^j(\tilde{L}_j) &= \int_{\tilde{L}_{j-1}}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)}\mathcal{L}_{B^j}\left(\tau(B^j,1), A^j(u)/A^j(\tilde{L}_j)\right)\mathrm{d}u \\ &= \int_{\tilde{L}_{j-1}}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)} + \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)} + \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)}\mathcal{L}_{B^j}\left(\tau(B^j,1), A^j(u)/A^j(\tilde{L}_j)\right)\mathrm{d}u \\ &=: \mathcal{J}_0^j + \mathcal{J}_1^j + \mathcal{J}_2^j. \end{aligned} \tag{4.72}$$

We start by bounding $\mathcal{J}_2^j$ and $\mathcal{J}_0^j$:

$$\mathcal{J}_2^j \le \left(\sup_{[0,1]} \mathcal{L}_{B^j}\left(\tau(B^j,1),.\right)\right) \times \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)}du.$$

Thanks to estimate (7.12) of [2] in which we take $x = e^{\epsilon h_t/2}$ and Lemma 4.7, there exists a positive constant c_1 such that for t is large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{J}_2^j < e^{-\epsilon h_t/2}\right) \ge 1 - e^{-c_1 h_t}. \tag{4.73}$$

For $\mathcal{J}_0^j$:

$$\mathcal{J}_0^j \le \left(\sup_{]-\infty,0]} \mathcal{L}_{B^j}\left(\tau(B^j,1),.\right)\right) \times \int_{\tilde{L}_{j-1}}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)}du.$$

Thanks to estimate (7.13) of [2] in which we take $x = e^{\epsilon h_t/2}$ and Lemma 4.6, there exists a positive constant c_2 such that for t is large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{J}_0^j < e^{-\epsilon h_t/2}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-c_2 h_t}. \tag{4.74}$$

For $\mathcal{J}_1^j$ we apply Lemma 4.8 and estimate (7.11) of [2] (applied with $\delta = e^{-(1-2\epsilon)h_t/2}$, $\epsilon = e^{-(1-2\epsilon)h_t/6}$), we get

$$\left|\mathcal{J}_1^j - e_j \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{\tau}_j(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du\right| \leq e^{-(1-2\epsilon)h_t/6} e_j \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du, \tag{4.75}$$

with probability greater than $1 - e^{-c_6 h_t}$, for some positive constant c_6, when t is large enough. Then,

$$\int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du \geq \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(\epsilon h_t/16)}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(\epsilon h_t/8)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} \int_{\tau(V^\uparrow, \epsilon h_t/16)}^{\tau(V^\uparrow, \epsilon h_t/8)} e^{-V^\uparrow(u)} du,$$

where we used Proposition 3.6 for the equality in law. We thus get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)} e^{-\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du \leq e^{-\epsilon h_t/8}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V^\uparrow, \epsilon h_t/8) - \tau(V^\uparrow, \epsilon h_t/16) \leq 1\right) \leq e^{-c_7 h_t}, \tag{4.76}$$

when t is large enough, according to (5.98) applied with $\alpha = \epsilon/8$, $\omega = \epsilon/16$, and where c_7 is a positive constant.

We have $\mathbb{P}(e_j \leq e^{-\epsilon h_t/8}) \underset{t\to+\infty}{\sim} e^{-\epsilon h_t/8}/2$, so combining with (4.75) and (4.76) we get, for some positive constant c_8 and t large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{J}_1^j > e^{-\epsilon h_t/5}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-c_8 h_t}. \tag{4.77}$$

Combining (4.77) with (4.73) and (4.74) we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{J}_0^j + \mathcal{J}_2^j \leq 2e^{-\epsilon h_t/5} \mathcal{J}_1^j\right) \geq 1 - e^{-c_9 h_t},$$

for some positive constant c_9, and when t is large enough. Combining with (4.72) and (4.75) we get the result.

□

Now, we approximate $A^j(\tilde{L}_j)$.

Lemma 4.10. *$S_j^t := \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du$ is independent from (e_j, R_j^t) and such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(S_j^t \leq A^j(\tilde{L}_j) \leq (1 + e^{-h_t/7}) S_j^t\right) \geq 1 - e^{-ch_t},$$

for some positive constant c, when t is large enough.

Proof. $S_j^t := \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du$ so (S_j^t, R_j^t) only depends on V and is thus independent from e_j which only depends on B^j. The independence between S_j^t and R_j^t comes from Proposition 3.6 : the latter gives the independence between $\tilde{P}_2^{(j)}$ and $\tilde{P}_3^{(j)}$ and allows to apply the Markov property

at time $\tau(\tilde{P}_2^{(j)}, h_t/2)$, since $\tilde{P}_2^{(j)} \overset{\mathfrak{L}}{=} (V^{\uparrow}(x))_{0\le x\le \tau(V^{\uparrow},h_t)}$. The random variables e_j, S_j^t and R_j^t are therefore mutually independent. Then, from the definitions of S_j^t and $A^j(\tilde{L}_j)$ we have

$$S_j^t \le A^j(\tilde{L}_j) = \int_{\tilde{m}_j}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du + S_j^t. \tag{4.78}$$

Applying successively Proposition 3.6 and estimate (5.100) with $h = h_t/2$, $\eta = 1/3$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{m}_j}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du \le e^{4h_t/6} \right) \ge 1 - e^{-c_1 h_t}, \tag{4.79}$$

for some positive constant c_1, when t is large enough. Then,

$$S_j^t \ge \int_{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{\tau}_j(h_t)} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du = \int_{\tilde{m}_j}^{\tilde{\tau}_j(h_t)} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du - \int_{\tilde{m}_j}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du.$$

Applying Proposition 3.6 for each term, and, for the first term, estimate (5.99) with $h = h_t$, $\eta = 1/6$, for the second term, (5.100) with $h = h_t/2$, $\eta = 1/3$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(S_j^t \ge e^{5h_t/6} - e^{4h_t/6} \right) \ge 1 - e^{-c_2 h_t}, \tag{4.80}$$

for some positive constant c_2, when t is large enough. Putting together (4.79) and (4.80) we get that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{m}_j}^{\tilde{\tau}_j^+(h_t/2)} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(u)} du / S_j^t \le e^{-h_t/7} \right) \ge 1 - e^{-c_3 h_t},$$

for some positive constant c_3, when t is large enough. This, combined with (4.78), yields the result.

□

Putting together (4.61), the *iid* character of the sequence $(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_j, \tilde{h}_j)_{1\le j\le n_t}$, Lemma 4.9 and Lemma 4.10, we obtain Proposition 4.5.

Thanks to this proposition, we can compare N_t with the overshoots of $\sum_{i=1} e_i S_i^t R_i^t$. For any $a \ge 0$, let us define

$$\mathcal{N}_a := \min\left\{ j \ge 0,\ \sum_{i=1}^{j} e_i S_i^t R_i^t > a \right\}.$$

Lemma 4.11. *Fix ϵ as in Proposition 4.5 and $\eta \in]0,1[$. Assume that t is so large such that $(1-e^{-\epsilon h_t/7})^{-1} < (1+\eta)$ and $(1+e^{-\epsilon h_t/7})^{-1}(1-2/\log(h_t)) \ge (1-\eta)$. Recall the events $\mathcal{A}_t^1$ and $\mathcal{A}_t^3$ introduced in respectively Fact 4.3 and Proposition 4.5. Then*

$$\mathcal{V}_{n_t,h_t} \cap \{N_t < n_t\} \cap \mathcal{A}_t^1 \cap \mathcal{A}_t^3 \subset \left\{ \mathcal{N}_{(1-\eta)t} \le N_t \le \mathcal{N}_{(1+\eta)t} \right\}.$$

Even though it is used in the following subsection, an other interest of this Lemma is to prepare the further study of the almost sure behavior of $\mathcal{L}_X^*(t)$. Indeed, for the almost sure behavior, the contribution of the last valley can be sometimes omitted, sometimes totally included, so we are left to study some behavior of $\sum_{i=1}^{N_t-1} e_i S_i^t R_i^t$ or $\sum_{i=1}^{N_t} e_i S_i^t R_i^t$, but the above lemma allows to replace N_t by some $\mathcal{N}_a$, which is more convenient since it only depends on the sequence $(e_i S_i^t R_i^t,\ i \ge 1)$.

Proof. Assume that the event $\mathcal{V}_{n_t,h_t} \cap \{N_t < n_t\} \cap \mathcal{A}_t^1 \cap \mathcal{A}_t^3$ is realized. Then, for any $k \leq n_t$ we have

$$N_t \geq k \Rightarrow H(m_k) \leq t \Rightarrow H(\tilde{m}_k) \leq t \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \Big(H(\tilde{L}_i) - H(\tilde{m}_i) \Big) \leq t$$
$$\Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} e_i S_i^t R_i^t \leq t(1 - e^{-\epsilon h_t/7})^{-1} \leq (1+\eta)t \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{(1+\eta)t} \geq k,$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}_{(1-\eta)t} \geq k \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} e_i S_i^t R_i^t \leq (1-\eta)t \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \Big(H(\tilde{L}_i) - H(\tilde{m}_i) \Big) \leq (1-\eta)(1 + e^{-\epsilon h_t/7})t$$
$$\Rightarrow H(\tilde{m}_k) \leq t \left[(1-\eta)(1+e^{-\epsilon h_t/7}) + 2/\log(h_t) \right] \leq t \Rightarrow H(m_k) \leq t \Rightarrow N_t \geq k.$$

We have thus proved that $\mathcal{N}_{(1-\eta)t} \leq N_t \leq \mathcal{N}_{(1+\eta)t}$ is satisfied on $\mathcal{V}_{n_t,h_t} \cap \{N_t < n_t\} \cap \mathcal{A}_t^1 \cap \mathcal{A}_t^3$.

□

4.3. **Proof of Proposition 4.1.** We now use the preceding results of this section to approach the repartition function of $\mathcal{L}_X^*(t)/t$ by a repartition function involving the sequence $(e_i S_i^t, e_i S_i^t R_i^t,\ i \geq 1)$. We first state two facts which come from Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 of [2].

Fact 4.12. *Fix ϵ as in Proposition 4.5. Let us define the repartition functions, depending on t,*

$$F_{\gamma,k}(x) := \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} \mathcal{L}_X(H(\tilde{L}_j), \tilde{m}_j) \leq \gamma t,\ \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (H(\tilde{L}_j) - H(\tilde{m}_j)) \leq xt \right),$$
$$F_{\gamma,k}^{\pm}(x) := \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} e_j S_j^t \leq \gamma t(1 \pm 2e^{-\epsilon h_t/7}),\ \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} e_j S_j^t R_j^t \leq xt(1 \pm 2e^{-\epsilon h_t/7}) \right).$$

Then, there is a positive constant c such that for any $2 \leq k \leq n_t$, $0 < x \leq 1$ and $\gamma > 0$ possibly depending on t,

$$F_{\gamma,k}^-(x) - e^{-ch_t} \leq F_{\gamma,k}(x) \leq F_{\gamma,k}^+(x) + e^{-ch_t},$$

for all t large enough.

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.5. □

Before stating the next fact we define $X_{\tilde{m}_j} := X(. + \tilde{m}_j)$ which is, according to the Markov property, a diffusion starting from $\tilde{m}_j$. We also define, for any $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $H_{X_{\tilde{m}_j}}(r)$ to be the hitting time of r by $X_{\tilde{m}_j}$.

Fact 4.13. *Fix ϵ as in Proposition 4.5 and recall the definition of $X_{\tilde{m}_1}$ in Subsection 5.6. We define the repartition functions, depending on t,*

$$f_\gamma(x) := \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{L}_{X_{\tilde{m}_1}}(t(1-x), \tilde{m}_1) \leq \gamma t, H_{X_{\tilde{m}_1}}(\tilde{L}_1) > t(1-x), H_{X_{\tilde{m}_1}}(\tilde{L}_1) < H_{X_{\tilde{m}_1}}(\tilde{L}_0) \right),$$
$$\tilde{f}_\gamma(x) := \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{y \in \mathcal{D}_1} \mathcal{L}_{X_{\tilde{m}_1}}(t(1-x), y) \leq \gamma t, H_{X_{\tilde{m}_1}}(\tilde{L}_1) > t(1-x), H_{X_{\tilde{m}_1}}(\tilde{L}_1) < H_{X_{\tilde{m}_1}}(\tilde{L}_0) \right),$$
$$f_\gamma^{\pm}(x) := \mathbb{P}\left(1/R_1^t \leq \gamma(1 \pm 2e^{-\epsilon h_t/7})/(1-x),\ e_1 S_1^t R_1^t > t(1-x)(1 \mp 2e^{-\epsilon h_t/7}) \right).$$

Then, there is a positive constant c such that for any $0 < x \leq 1$ and $\gamma > 0$ possibly depending on t,

$$f_\gamma^-(x) - e^{-ch_t} \leq \tilde{f}_\gamma(x) \leq f_\gamma(x) \leq f_\gamma^+(x) + e^{-ch_t},$$

for all t large enough.

For the justification of this fact in our context, we give some details in the end of Section 5.

In order to generalize Lemma 5.4 of [2] to our context, let us recall the definition of the functionals $\tilde{K}_{I,a}$ and $\tilde{K}^-_{I,a}$ defined there :

$$\forall a > 0, \quad \tilde{K}_{I,a}(f_1, f_2) := f_2(f_2^{-1}(a)), \quad \tilde{K}^-_{I,a}(f_1, f_2) := f_2(f_2^{-1}(a)-).$$

Note that these functionals actually do not involve f_1. According to Lemma 4.5 of [2], $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ is almost surely a point of continuity for these functionals. Thanks to this we can prove :

Lemma 4.14.

$$\lim_{\eta \to 0} \limsup_{t \to +\infty} \left(s(\eta, t) := \sum_{k \leq n_t} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^{k} e_i S_i^t R_i^t > 1 - \eta/2,\ 1 - 2\eta < \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} e_i S_i^t R_i^t \leq 1 - \eta \right) \right) = 0. \tag{4.81}$$

$$\lim_{\eta \to 0} \limsup_{t \to +\infty} \left(\tilde{s}(\eta, t) := 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\eta t \leq H(m_{N_t}) \leq (1-\eta)t \right) \right) = 0. \tag{4.82}$$

This result is less precise than Lemma 5.4 of [2] of which it is the analogue, but even in [2], they only need that the limits in t converge to 0 when η goes to 0. We can thus substitute our Lemma to theirs.

Proof. The events $\left\{ \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^{k} e_i S_i^t R_i^t > 1 - \eta/2,\ 1 - 2\eta < \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} e_i S_i^t R_i^t \leq 1 - \eta \right\}$ for $k \in \{1, ..., n_t\}$ are clearly disjoint so

$$\begin{aligned} s(\eta, t) =& \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}_{(1-\eta)t}} e_i S_i^t R_i^t > 1 - \eta/2,\ 1 - 2\eta < \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}_{(1-\eta)t}-1} e_i S_i^t R_i^t \leq 1 - \eta,\ \mathcal{N}_{(1-\eta)t} \leq n_t \right) \\ =& \mathbb{P}\left(Y_2^t(Y_2^{t,-1}(1-\eta)) > 1 - \eta/2,\ Y_2^t(Y_2^{t,-1}(1-\eta)-) > 1 - 2\eta,\ \mathcal{N}_{(1-\eta)t} \leq n_t \right) \\ =& \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{K}_{I,1-\eta}(Y_2^t) > 1 - \eta/2,\ \tilde{K}^-_{I,1-\eta}(Y_2^t) > 1 - 2\eta,\ \mathcal{N}_{(1-\eta)t} \leq n_t \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, according to Proposition 4.2 (to be proved in the following subsection), (Y_2^t, Y_2^t) converges to $(\mathcal{Y}_2, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ for the convergence in distribution in $D(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^2)$ with the J_1 topology, and we have that for any fixed $\eta \in]0, 1/2[$, $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ is almost surely a point of continuity for $\tilde{K}_{I,1-\eta}$ and $\tilde{K}^-_{I,1-\eta}$. We thus get

$$\limsup_{t \to +\infty} s(\eta, t) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\eta)) > 1 - \eta/2,\ \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\eta)-) > 1 - 2\eta \right), \tag{4.83}$$

and we now study the limit when η goes to 0. Since $\mathcal{Y}_2$ is a κ-stable subordinator, it is known that almost surely $E_0 := 1 - \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)-) > 0$ so $\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\eta) = \mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)$ for all $0 < \eta < E_0$ and $\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\eta)-) \leq 1 - 2\eta$ for all $0 < \eta < E_0/2$. This proves that almost surely, the event in the probability in (4.83) fails to happen for all η small enough, so by dominated convergence, this probability converges to 0 when η goes to 0. This proves (4.81).

Let us fix ϵ as in Proposition 4.5, put $\epsilon_t := e^{-\epsilon h_t/7}$ and choose t large enough so that $2/\log h_t \leq \eta, (1-\epsilon_t)^{-1} \leq 2, (1-3\eta) \leq (1-2\eta)(1+\epsilon_t)^{-1}$. Using successively the definitions of $\mathcal{A}_t^1$ and $\mathcal{A}_t^3$

and Lemma 4.11, we get that $\mathbb{P}(\eta t \le H(m_{N_t}) \le (1-\eta)t)$ is greater than

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\eta t \le H(m_{N_t}) \le (1-\eta)t,\ \mathcal{V}_{n_t,h_t},\ N_t \le n_t,\ \mathcal{A}_t^1 \cap \mathcal{A}_t^3\right)\\
\ge&\mathbb{P}\left(\eta t \le \sum_{i=1}^{N_t-1}\left(H(\tilde{L}_i) - H(\tilde{m}_i)\right) \le (1-2\eta)t \le \left(1-\eta-\frac{2}{\log h_t}\right)t,\ \mathcal{V}_{n_t,h_t},\ N_t \le n_t,\ \mathcal{A}_t^1 \cap \mathcal{A}_t^3\right)\\
\ge&\mathbb{P}\left(\eta(1-\epsilon_t)^{-1}t \le 2\eta t \le \sum_{i=1}^{N_t-1} e_i S_i^t R_i^t \le (1-3\eta)t \le (1-2\eta)(1+\epsilon_t)^{-1}t,\ \mathcal{V}_{n_t,h_t},\ N_t \le n_t,\ \mathcal{A}_t^1 \cap \mathcal{A}_t^3\right)\\
\ge&\mathbb{P}\left(2\eta t \le \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}_{(1-\eta)t}-1} e_i S_i^t R_i^t \le \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{N}_{(1+\eta)t}-1} e_i S_i^t R_i^t \le (1-3\eta)t,\ \mathcal{V}_{n_t,h_t},\ N_t \le n_t,\ \mathcal{A}_t^1 \cap \mathcal{A}_t^3\right)\\
=&\mathbb{P}\left(2\eta \le Y_2^t(Y_2^{t,-1}(1-\eta)-) \le Y_2^t(Y_2^{t,-1}(1+\eta)-) \le (1-3\eta),\ \mathcal{V}_{n_t,h_t},\ N_t \le n_t,\ \mathcal{A}_t^1 \cap \mathcal{A}_t^3\right)\\
=&\mathbb{P}\left(2\eta \le \tilde{K}^-_{I,1-\eta}(Y_2^t) \le \tilde{K}^-_{I,1+\eta}(Y_2^t) \le (1-3\eta),\ \mathcal{V}_{n_t,h_t},\ N_t \le n_t,\ \mathcal{A}_t^1 \cap \mathcal{A}_t^3\right).
\end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 3.5, Fact 4.3, Proposition 4.5 and Lemma 4.16 of the following subsection, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathcal{V}_{n_t,h_t} \cap \{N_t \le n_t\} \cap \mathcal{A}_t^1 \cap \mathcal{A}_t^3\right) \underset{t\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1,$$

and again, from the convergence of (Y_2^t, Y_2^t) to $(\mathcal{Y}_2, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ and the continuity of $\tilde{K}^-_{I,1-\eta}$, we get

$$\limsup_{t\to+\infty} \tilde{s}(\eta,t) \le 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(2\eta \le \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\eta)-) \le \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1+\eta)-) \le (1-3\eta)\right). \tag{4.84}$$

Here again, we have almost surely $E_0 := \min\{\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)) - 1,\ 1 - \mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)-)\} > 0$ so $\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1+\eta) = \mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)$ for all $0 \le \eta \le E_0$ and $\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1+\eta)-) \le (1-3\eta)$ for $\eta \le E_0/3$. Also, $\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\eta) = \mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1)$ for all $0 \le \eta \le E_0$ and $\mathcal{Y}_2(\mathcal{Y}_2^{-1}(1-\eta)-) \ge 2\eta$ for $0 \le \eta \le \min\{E_0, (1-E_0)/2\}$. This proves that almost surely, the event in the probability in (4.84) happens for all η small enough, so by dominated convergence, this probability converges to 1 when η goes to 0. This proves (4.82).

□

Proof. of Proposition 4.1 The proof of Proposition 5.1 of [2] can be identically repeated here. We only replace W_κ by V, consider the standard valleys to be defined in our sens, replace the random times $\tilde{L}_j^-$ of [2] by $\tilde{L}_{j-1}$, and we use our estimates instead of theirs : Estimates (3.1), (3.2), (3.3), (5.2), (5.3), Lemmas 2.2, 3.2, 3.4, 4.1, 5.2, 5.3, Proposition 3.5 and the proof of Lemma 3.6 of [2] have to be replaced here by respectively Fact 4.3, the combination of Lemma 5.21 and Lemma 5.20, Lemma 4.16 of the following subsection, (4.81), (4.82), the combination of Lemma 3.5 and Remark 3.4, the second point of Fact 4.4, the third point of Fact 4.4, Lemma 4.15 of the following subsection, Fact 4.12, Fact 4.13, Proposition 4.5 and the discussion before Lemma 4.6.

The only difference is that, since our definition of $\mathcal{D}_j$ is different, we do not need an analogue of (5.14) from [2] : it follows from our definition of $\mathcal{D}_j$ that $\mathcal{D}_j \subset [\tau_1^-(h_t/2), \tau_1(h_t/2)]$, so we can use Lemma 4.8 to bound $A^j(u)/A^j(\tilde{L}_j)$ on $\mathcal{D}_j$, which is the key to get the analogue of (5.17) from [2].

□

4.4. **Proof of Proposition 4.2 and consequences.** This proposition relies on :

Lemma 4.15. *Fix $\eta \in]0,1/3[$ and Recall the constant $\mathcal{C}'$ defined in the Introduction. We have*

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \sup_{x\in\left[e^{-(1-2\eta)\phi(t)},+\infty\right[} \left| x^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}\left(e_1 S_1^t/t > x\right) - \mathcal{C}' \right| = 0, \tag{4.85}$$

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \sup_{y\in\left[e^{-(1-3\eta)\phi(t)},+\infty\right[} \left| y^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}\left(e_1 S_1^t R_1^t/t > y\right) - \mathcal{C}'\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{R}^\kappa\right] \right| = 0. \tag{4.86}$$

For any positive α, $e^{\kappa\phi(t)}\mathbb{P}(e_1 S_1^t/t \geq x,\ e_1 S_1^t R_1^t/t \geq y)$ converges uniformly when t goes to infinity on $[\alpha,+\infty[\times[\alpha,+\infty[$ to $\mathcal{C}' y^{-\kappa}\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}^\kappa \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{R}\leq y/x}] + \mathcal{C}' x^{-\kappa}\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{R} > y/x)$.

Proof. We start by proving a convergence analogue to (4.3) of [2] :

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \sup_{x\in\left[e^{-(1-\eta)\phi(t)},+\infty\right[} \left| x^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)} \mathbb{P}\left(S_1^t/t > x\right) - \mathcal{C} \right| = 0. \tag{4.87}$$

and we will deduce the first statement. First,

$$S_1^t = \int_{\tilde{\tau}_1^+(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{\tau}_1(h_t)} e^{\tilde{V}^{(1)}(u)} du + \int_{\tilde{\tau}_1(h_t)}^{\tilde{L}_1} e^{\tilde{V}^{(1)}(u)} du. \tag{4.88}$$

From Proposition 3.6 we get

$$\frac{1}{t}\int_{\tilde{\tau}_1(h_t)}^{\tilde{L}_1} e^{\tilde{V}^{(1)}(u)} du \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} \frac{e^{h_t}}{t}\int_0^{\tau(V,]-\infty,-h_t/2])} e^{V(y)} dy = e^{-\phi(t)} \int_0^{\tau(V,]-\infty,-h_t/2])} e^{V(y)} dy, \tag{4.89}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{t}\int_{\tilde{\tau}_1(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{\tau}_1(h_t)} e^{\tilde{V}^{(1)}(u)} du \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} \frac{1}{t}\int_{\tau(V^\uparrow,h_t/2)}^{\tau(V^\uparrow,h_t)} e^{V(y)} dy \leq e^{-\phi(t)}\tau(V^\uparrow,h_t). \tag{4.90}$$

By the second assertion of Lemma 5.3,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(y)} dy > u\right) \underset{u\to+\infty}{\sim} \mathcal{C} u^{-\kappa}. \tag{4.91}$$

We define $\epsilon_t := e^{-\eta\phi(t)/2}$ and take $x \in \left[e^{-(1-\eta)\phi(t)},+\infty\right[$ (this implies $xe^{\phi(t)} \geq e^{\eta\phi(t)}$ which converges to infinity). From (4.88), (4.89), and (4.90), $x^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)}\mathbb{P}\left(S_1^t/t > x\right)$ is less than

$$x^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)}\mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V^\uparrow,h_t) > xe^{\phi(t)}\epsilon_t\right) + x^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)}\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(y)} dy > (1-\epsilon_t)xe^{\phi(t)}\right).$$

From Lemma 5.6, the limit of the first term is 0, and from (4.91) the limit of the first second is $\mathcal{C}$. We get

$$\limsup_{t\to+\infty} \sup_{x\in\left[e^{-(1-\eta)\phi(t)},+\infty\right[} x^\kappa e^{\kappa\phi(t)}\mathbb{P}\left(S_1^t/t > x\right) \leq \mathcal{C}. \tag{4.92}$$

From the Markov property applied at time $\tau(V,]-\infty,-h_t/2])$ we have

$$e^{-\phi(t)}\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(y)} dy \overset{\mathcal{L}}{=} e^{-\phi(t)}\int_0^{\tau(V,]-\infty,-h_t/2])} e^{V(y)} dy + e^{V(\tau(V,]-\infty,-h_t/2]))-\phi(t)}\int_0^{+\infty} e^{\tilde{V}(y)} dy,$$

where $\tilde{V}$ is an independent copy of V. We now put $\epsilon_t := e^{-h_t/4}$ and note that $V(\tau(V,]-\infty,-h_t/2]) < -h_t/2$. Then, $\mathbb{P}(e^{-\phi(t)}\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(y)}dy > x(1+\epsilon_t))$ is less than

$$\mathbb{P}\left(e^{-\phi(t)}\int_0^{\tau(V,]-\infty,-h_t/2])} e^{V(y)}dy > x\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(e^{-h_t/2-\phi(t)}\int_0^{+\infty} e^{\tilde{V}(y)}dy > x\epsilon_t\right)$$
$$\leq \mathbb{P}\left(S_1^t/t > x\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(e^{-h_t/2-\phi(t)}\int_0^{+\infty} e^{\tilde{V}(y)}dy > x\epsilon_t\right),$$

where we used (4.89) and (4.88) for the first term. Using (4.91) in the above inequality we get

$$\liminf_{t\to+\infty} \inf_{x\in\left[e^{-(1-\eta)\phi(t)},+\infty\right[} x^{\kappa}e^{\kappa\phi(t)}\mathbb{P}\left(S_1^t/t > x\right) \geq \mathcal{C}.$$

Combining this with (4.92) we get 4.87.

Now that we have (4.87), the rest of the proof is exactly the same as the proof of Lemma 4.1 in [2] once they have proved (4.3). The argument crucially needs the fact that $(R_1^t)_{t>1}$ converges in distribution to $\mathcal{R}$ and is bounded in all L^p spaces. This is true from Proposition 3.8 applied with $h = h_t$, so the lemma is proved.

□

In [2], the proof of Proposition 1.4 (that is, the convergence of $(Y_1, Y_2)^t$ toward $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$) relies only on their Lemma 4.1 from which is proved the tightness of the family $(Y_1, Y_2)^t$ and the identification of the limit distribution. Using Lemma 4.15 instead of Lemma 4.1 of [2], the same proof can be repeated here and we get Proposition 4.2.

As an other consequence of Lemma 4.15, we can prove that no more than n_t valleys are visited until instant t. This is fundamental since most of the estimates we have are true not for all but for the first n_t valleys.

Lemma 4.16. *There is a positive constant c such that for all t large enough,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(N_t \geq n_t\right) \leq e^{-ch_t}.$$

Proof. We have $\{N_t \geq n_t\} = \{H(m_{n_t}) \leq t\}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n_t-1} H(\tilde{L}_i) - H(\tilde{m}_i) \leq H(\tilde{m}_{n_t}) = H(m_{n_t})$ on $\mathcal{V}_{n_t,h_t}$. Let us fix ϵ as in Proposition 4.5. Using the definition of $\mathcal{A}_t^3$ there, we get that $\mathbb{P}(\{N_t \geq n_t\} \cap \mathcal{V}_{n_t,h_t} \cap \mathcal{A}_t^3)$ is less than

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_t-1} H(\tilde{L}_i) - H(\tilde{m}_i) \leq t,\ \mathcal{A}_t^3\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_t-1} e_i S_i^t R_i^t \leq t(1-e^{-\epsilon h_t/7})^{-1}\right)$$
$$\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{1\leq i\leq n_t-1} e_i S_i^t R_i^t \leq t(1-e^{-\epsilon h_t/7})^{-1}\right) \leq \left[1-\mathbb{P}\left(e_1 S_1^t R_1^t/t > (1-e^{-\epsilon h_t/7})^{-1}\right)\right]^{n_t-1}$$
$$\leq \exp\left[-(n_t-1)\mathbb{P}\left(e_1 S_1^t R_1^t/t > (1-e^{-\epsilon h_t/7})^{-1}\right)\right],$$

where the last inequality comes from $\log(1-x) \leq -x$ for $x \in [0,1[$. According to Lemma 4.15 and the definition of n_t, we have that

$$(n_t-1)\mathbb{P}(e_1 S_1^t R_1^t/t > (1-e^{-\epsilon h_t/7})^{-1}) \underset{t\to+\infty}{\sim} \mathcal{C}'\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{R}^{\kappa}\right] e^{\kappa\delta\phi(t)},$$

so $\mathbb{P}(\{N_t \geq n_t\} \cap \mathcal{V}_{n_t,h_t} \cap \mathcal{A}_t^3) \leq e^{-h_t}$ for t large enough. Also, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{V}_{n_t,h_t}^c) \leq n_t e^{-\delta\kappa h_t/3}$ for t large enough according to Lemma 3.5 and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_t^{3,c})$ has an upper bound given by Proposition 4.5. The result follows. □

5. Some estimates on V, $V^{\uparrow}$, $\hat{V}^{\uparrow}$ and the diffusion in V

In this section, we prove some estimates for the processes V, $V^{\uparrow}$ and $\hat{V}^{\uparrow}$, especially about the hitting times and the exponential functionals of these processes. We also prove some facts used in Section 4. Even though Section 4 gives the main ideas, the estimates we prove here actually represent the biggest part of the work for the proof of Theorem 1.3. Some of them are rather classical but some others, especially those of Subsection 5.5, are new and technical. They are used in this paper in place of simpler estimates that are true in the case of a drifted brownian potential, but not for a general spectrally negative Lévy potential.

5.1. Estimates on V.

Lemma 5.1. *Let a, b be positive numbers and define $T := \inf\{x \geq 0,\ V(x) \notin [-a, b]\}$, then*

$$(1 - e^{-\kappa a})e^{-\kappa b} \leq \mathbb{P}\left(V(T) = b\right) \leq e^{-\kappa b}.$$

Proof. For the upper bound, $\mathbb{P}\left(V(T) = b\right) \leq \mathbb{P}(\sup_{[0,+\infty[} V \geq b) = e^{-\kappa b}$.

For the lower bound, note that the process $e^{\kappa V(.\wedge T)}$ is a bounded martingale so, by the convergence theorem for martingales and the dominated convergence theorem we get

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\kappa V(T)}\right] &= \mathbb{P}\left(V(T) \leq -a\right)\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\kappa V(T)} | V(T) \leq -a\right] + \mathbb{P}\left(V(T) = b\right)e^{\kappa b} \\ &\leq e^{-\kappa a} + \mathbb{P}\left(V(T) = b\right)e^{\kappa b}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the result.

□

We now study how V leaves an intervalle from below. More precisely, we control the moments of $V\left(\tau(V,]-\infty, -1])\right)$. This is where the assumption $V(1) \in L^p$ for some $p > 1$ becomes necessary for Theorem 1.3.

Lemma 5.2.

$$\forall p \geq 1,\ V(1) \in L^p \Rightarrow V\left(\tau(V,]-\infty, -1])\right) \in L^p.$$

Proof. We use $V^{<-r}$ as defined in Subsection 1.2, where r is chosen such that $V - V^{<-r}$ drifts to $-\infty$. Let κ_r denote the non trivial zero of $\Psi_{V-V^{<-r}}$. We fix $x \geq r$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(|1 + V\left(\tau(V,]-\infty, -1])\right)| > x\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(\Delta V,]-\infty, -x]) \leq \tau(V,]-\infty, -1])\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(V\left(\tau(\Delta V,]-\infty, -x])-\right) \geq -1\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left(V - V^{<-r}\right)\left(\tau(\Delta V,]-\infty, -x])-\right) \geq -1\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, since $x > r$, we have $\tau(\Delta V,]-\infty, -x]) = \tau(\Delta V^{<-r},]-\infty, -x])$ which is independent from $(V - V^{<-r})$, because $(V - V^{<-r})$ and $V^{<-r}$ are independent. We thus get that $\mathbb{P}(|1 + V(\tau(V,]-\infty, -1]))| > x)$ is less than

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\left(V - V^{<-r}\right)\left(\tau(\Delta V^{<-r},]-\infty, -x])\right) \geq -1\right) &\leq e^{\kappa_r/2}\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\kappa_r(V-V^{<-r})\left(\tau(\Delta V^{<-r},]-\infty, -x])\right)/2}\right] \\ &= e^{\kappa_r/2}\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\Psi_{V-V^{<-r}}(\kappa_r/2)\tau(\Delta V^{<-r},]-\infty, -x])}\right], \end{aligned}$$

where we used Markov's inequality. Then, note that $\Psi_{V-V^{<-r}}(\kappa_r/2) < 0$ thanks to the definition of κ_r, and that $\tau(\Delta V^{<-r},]-\infty, -x])$ follows an exponential distribution with parameter $\nu(]-$

$\infty, -x])$. We thus get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|1+V\left(\tau(V,]-\infty,-1])\right)|>x\right) \leq \frac{e^{\kappa_r/2}}{1-\Psi_{V-V^{<-r}}(\kappa_r/2)/\nu(]-\infty,-x])} \leq C\nu(]-\infty,-x]), \tag{5.93}$$

where we put $C := -e^{\kappa_r/2}/\Psi_{V-V^{<-r}}(\kappa_r/2) > 0$. We now choose $p \geq 1$ and assume $V(1) \in L^p$. Theorem 25.3 in [13] implies that $\int_{-\infty}^{-r} |x|^p \nu(dx) < +\infty$, or equivalently $\int_r^{+\infty} x^{p-1}\nu(]-\infty,-x])dx < +\infty$. Using (5.93) we deduce that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{-r} x^{p-1}\mathbb{P}\left(|1+V\left(\tau(V,]-\infty,-1])\right)|>x\right)dx < +\infty,$$

so $V(\tau(V,]-\infty,-1])) \in L^p$.

□

The next lemma is fundamental. In Section 4, it allows us to compute precisely the right tails of the contributions to the local and to the time spent by the diffusion in the bottoms of the valleys. This allows to prove that the sum of these contributions converges to the κ-stable subordinator $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2)$ from which is constructed the limit distribution in Theorem 1.3.

Lemma 5.3.

- *There is a positive constant c such that for x small enough,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(u)}du \leq x\right) \leq c\sqrt{x}.$$

- $$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(u)}du \geq x\right) \underset{x\to+\infty}{\sim} \mathcal{C}x^{-\kappa},$$

where as in the Introduction, $\mathcal{C}$ is the constant in Corollary 5 of [4].

Proof. For the first assertion, our argument is very close to the one given at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 3 in [4], but to be into their setting we would have to assume the existence of finite exponential moments for $-V$ which we do not. We thus give some details.

We use $V^{<-1}$ as defined in Subsection 1.2. For $x > 0$, and $\eta > 0$ that will be chosen later, the probability $\mathbb{P}(\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(u)}du \leq x)$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(u)}du \leq x,\ V^{<-1}(\eta)=0\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(u)}du \leq x,\ V^{<-1}(\eta)\neq 0\right)\\
\leq&\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{\eta} e^{(V-V^{<-1})(u)}du \leq x,\ V^{<-1}(\eta)=0\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(V^{<-1}(\eta)\neq 0\right)\\
\leq&\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{\eta} e^{(V-V^{<-1})(u)}du \leq x\right) + 1 - e^{-\eta\nu(]-\infty,-1[)},
\end{aligned}$$

because $V^{<-1}$ is a compound Poisson process that jumps at rate $\nu(]-\infty,-1[)$. We get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(u)}du \leq x\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{\eta} e^{(V-V^{<-1})(u)}du \leq x\right) + \eta\nu(]-\infty,-1[). \tag{5.94}$$

$V - V^{<-1}$ is a Lévy process with bounded jumps so the arguments of [4] apply and yield

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^\eta e^{(V-V^{<-1})(u)}du \le x\right) &\le \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{[0,\eta]} -(V-V^{<-1}) \ge \log(\eta/x)\right)\\ &\le 2\mathbb{P}\left(-(V-V^{<-1})(\eta) \ge \log(\eta/x)\right)\\ &\le \frac{2x}{\eta}\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-(V-V^{<-1})(\eta)}\right]\\ &= \frac{2x}{\eta}e^{\eta\Psi_{-(V-V^{<-1})}(1)},\end{aligned}$$

where we used Markov's inequality. The crucial point is that the Laplace exponent at 1 : $\Psi_{-(V-V^{<-1})}(1)$ is defined and finite since $V - V^{<-1}$, having bounded jumps, has a Laplace transform defined on the whole complexe plane (Theorem 25.3 in [13]). Now, combining with (5.94) and choosing $\eta = \sqrt{x}$, we get, for any x small enough so that $e^{\sqrt{x}\Psi_{-(V-V^{<-1})}(1)} \le 2$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(u)}du \le x\right) \le (4 + \nu(]-\infty,-1[))\sqrt{x},$$

which yields the first assertion.

We now prove the second assertion, it is only an application of Corollary 5 of [4] to $-V$. Since V is spectrally negative, we know that V has a Laplace transform which is defined on $[0,+\infty[$ and the θ in the corollary is the non-trivial zero of the Laplace exponent of V, that is κ. To check the Cramer's condition, we use the decomposition $V = (V - V^{<-1}) + V^{<-1}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[|V(x)|\exp(\kappa V(x))\right] &\le \mathbb{E}\left[|(V-V^{<-1})(x)|\exp\left(\kappa(V-V^{<-1})(x) + \kappa V^{<-1}(x)\right)\right]\\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[|V^{<-1}(x)|\exp\left(\kappa(V-V^{<-1})(x) + \kappa V^{<-1}(x)\right)\right]\\ &\le \mathbb{E}\left[|(V-V^{<-1})(x)|\exp\left(\kappa(V-V^{<-1})(x)\right)\right]\\ &\quad + M\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\kappa(V-V^{<-1})(x)\right)\right].\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $V^{<-1}(x) \le 0$ for the first term and, for the second term, the fact that, since $V^{<-1}(x) \le 0$, $|V^{<-1}(x)|\exp(\kappa V^{<-1}(x))$ is deterministically bounded by M, the constant bounding $(y \mapsto ye^{-\kappa y})$ on $\mathbb{R}_+$. Then, since $V - V^{<-1}$ is a Lévy process with bounded jumps, $(V - V^{<-1})(x)$ admits finite exponential moments of any positive and negative order (see Theorem 25.3 in [13]). As a consequence the above expression is finite which yields the Cramer's condition. Finally, V is indeed not arithmetic because it is spectrally negative and not the opposite of a subordinator. The hypothesis of Corollary 5 of [4] are thus satisfied for $-V$ and we get the second assertion.

□

Lemma 5.4. *There are two positive constants c_1, c_2 such that*

$$\forall y, r > 0,\ \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V,]-\infty,-y]) > r\right) \le e^{c_1 y - c_2 r}.$$

Proof. Let us choose $c_1 \in]0,\kappa[$ and define $c_2 := -\Psi_V(c_1)$. c_2 is positive because of the definition of κ. We have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V,]-\infty,-y]) > r\right) \le \mathbb{P}\left(V(r) > -y\right) \le e^{c_1 y}\mathbb{E}\left[e^{c_1 V(r)}\right] = e^{c_1 y - c_2 r},$$

where we used Markov's inequality.

□

Lemma 5.5. *Choose $\eta \in]0,1[$, then*

$$\forall a,b>0,\ \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V-\underline{V},a)<\tau(\underline{V},]-\infty,-b])\right)\leq (b/\eta a+1)e^{-\kappa(1-\eta)a}.$$

Proof. We first remark that

$$\left\{\tau(V-\underline{V},a)<\tau(\underline{V},]-\infty,-\eta a])\right\}\subset\left\{\sup_{[0,+\infty[}V>(1-\eta)a\right\}$$

so

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V-\underline{V},a)<\tau(\underline{V},]-\infty,-\eta a])\right)\leq e^{-\kappa(1-\eta)a}. \tag{5.95}$$

In order to establish a boundary with b instead of ηa, we define the sequence of stopping times $(T_i)_{i\geq 0}$ by $T_0:=0$ and

$$T_{i+1}:=\min\left(\tau(V^{T_i}-\underline{V}^{T_i},a),\tau\left(\underline{V}^{T_i},]-\infty,-\eta a]\right)\right).$$

We have

$$\bigcap_{i=0}^{\lfloor b/\eta a+1\rfloor}\left\{\tau(V^{T_i}-\underline{V}^{T_i},a)\geq\tau(\underline{V}^{T_i},]-\infty,-\eta a])\right\}\subset\left\{\tau(V-\underline{V},a)\geq\tau(\underline{V},]-\infty,-b])\right\},$$

and by the Markov property applied at the stopping times T_i, the events in the intersection have all the same probability, so taking the complementary

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V-\underline{V},a)<\tau(\underline{V},]-\infty,-b])\right)&\leq\lfloor b/\eta a+1\rfloor\mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V-\underline{V},a)<\tau(\underline{V},]-\infty,-\eta a])\right)\\&\leq(b/\eta a+1)e^{-\kappa(1-\eta)a}.\end{aligned}$$

□

5.2. **Estimates on $V^{\uparrow}$.** We define $V^{\sharp}$ to be "V conditioned to drift to $+\infty$", as in [3], page 193. The Laplace exponent $\Psi_{V^{\sharp}}$ of $V^{\sharp}$ satisfies $\Psi_{V^{\sharp}}=\Psi_V(\kappa+.)$. As a consequence $\Psi'_{V^{\sharp}}(0)>0$, so $V^{\sharp}$ drift to infinity (because of Corollary VII.2 in [3]) and it is also proven that $V^{\uparrow}=(V^{\sharp})^{\uparrow}$. Therefore, for $x>0$, $V_x^{\uparrow}$ is only $V_x^{\sharp}$ conditioned in the usual sense to remain positive, which is a useful property for our proofs.

Also, note that from the definition of the law of $V^{\sharp}$ in [3], we have

$$\forall\lambda>-\kappa,\ \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda V^{\sharp}(1)}\right]=\mathbb{E}\left[e^{(\lambda+\kappa)V(1)}\right]<+\infty, \tag{5.96}$$

so the spectrally negative Lévy process $V^{\sharp}$ has its Laplace transform, as well as its Laplace exponent $\Psi_{V^{\sharp}}$, defined on the half-plane $\{\mathcal{K}(z)>-\kappa\}$.

Lemma 5.6. *(Lemma 3.4 of [15])*

There are two positive constants c_1,c_2 such that

$$\forall y,r>0,\ \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V^{\uparrow},y)>r\right)\leq e^{c_1y-c_2r}.$$

Lemma 5.7. *There are two positive constants c_1,c_2 such that, for all $1<a<b$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[}V_b^{\uparrow}<a\right)\leq c_2e^{-c_1(b-a)}.$$

Proof. $V_b^\uparrow$ is only $V_b^\sharp$ conditioned in the usual sense to stay positive, so

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} V_b^\uparrow < a\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(0 < \inf_{[0,+\infty[} V_b^\sharp < a\right)/\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} V_b^\sharp > 0\right)$$
$$\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} V^\sharp < a-b\right)/\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} V^\sharp > -b\right).$$

Then, according to [3] page 192, the Laplace transform of $\inf_{[0,+\infty[} V^\sharp$ is given by

$$\forall \lambda \geq 0,\ \mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda \inf_{[0,+\infty[} V^\sharp}\right] = \Psi'_{V^\sharp}(0)\frac{\lambda}{\Psi_{V^\sharp}(\lambda)}. \tag{5.97}$$

As we said in the beginning of this subsection, $\Psi_{V^\sharp}$ extends analytically on a neighborhood of 0 and has a non null derivative at 0, so (5.97) extends too and $\inf_{[0,+\infty[} V^\sharp$ admits a Laplace transform on a neighborhood of 0. Choosing $c_1 > 0$ such that $-c_1$ is in this neighborhood and $c_2 := \mathbb{E}[e^{-c_1 \inf_{[0,+\infty[} V^\sharp}]/\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} V^\sharp > -1\right)$, we get the result by Chernoff's inequality.

□

Lemma 5.8. *There are two positive constants c_1 and c_2 such that for any $0 < \alpha < \omega$, $\eta \in]0,1[$ and all h large enough, we have*

$$P\left(\tau(V^\uparrow, \omega h) - \tau(V^\uparrow, \alpha h) \leq 1\right) \leq e^{-c_1(\omega-\alpha)h}, \tag{5.98}$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{\tau(V^\uparrow,h)} e^{V^\uparrow(u)}du \geq e^{(1-\eta)h}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-c_2\eta h/2}, \tag{5.99}$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{\tau(V^\uparrow,h)} e^{V^\uparrow(u)}du \leq e^{(1+\eta)h}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-h}. \tag{5.100}$$

Proof. From the Markov property at time $\tau(V^\uparrow, \alpha h)$ and the fact that $V^\uparrow_{\alpha h}$ is $V^\sharp_{\alpha h}$ conditioned in the usual sense to stay positive we have that $\mathbb{P}(\tau(V^\uparrow, \omega h) - \tau(V^\uparrow, \alpha h) \leq 1)$ equals

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V^\uparrow_{\alpha h}, \omega h) \leq 1\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V^\sharp_{\alpha h}, \omega h) \leq 1,\ \inf_{[0,+\infty[} V^\sharp_{\alpha h} > 0\right)/\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} V^\sharp_{\alpha h} > 0\right)$$
$$= \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V^\sharp, (\omega-\alpha)h) \leq 1,\ \inf_{[0,+\infty[} V^\sharp > -\alpha h\right)/\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} V^\sharp > -\alpha h\right)$$
$$\leq 2\mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V^\sharp, (\omega-\alpha)h) \leq 1\right),$$

for h large enough,

$$\leq 2e \times \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\tau(V^\sharp,(\omega-\alpha)h)}\right] = 2e \times e^{-\psi^{-1}_{V^\sharp}(1)(\omega-\alpha)h},$$

where we used Chernoff's inequality, the fact that $\tau(V^\sharp, .)$ is a subordinator with Laplace exponent $\psi^{-1}_{V^\sharp}$ (see Theorem VII.1 in [3]) and the fact that $\psi^{-1}_{V^\sharp}(1) > 0$ (because $\psi_{V^\sharp}(0) = 0$).

(5.99) is an easy consequence of Lemma 5.7 applied with $a = (1-\eta)h$, $b = (1-\eta/2)h$, and (5.98) applied with $\alpha = 1-\eta/2$, $\omega = 1$.

Then, we have obviously,

$$\int_0^{\tau(V^\uparrow,h)} e^{V^\uparrow(u)}du \leq e^h \tau(V^\uparrow, h),$$

so

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{\tau(V^\uparrow,h)} e^{V^\uparrow(u)}du > e^{(1+\eta)h}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V^\uparrow, h) > e^{\eta h}\right) \leq e^{-h},$$

for h large enough according to Lemma 5.6. This yields (5.100).

□

5.3. **Estimates on $\hat{V}^{\uparrow}$.** The aim of this subsection is to get, for $\hat{V}^{\uparrow}$, estimates similar to those that we proved for $V^{\uparrow}$ in the last subsection. We start with a generalization of Lemma 5.7.

Lemma 5.9. *For all $z \geq 0$ and $0 < a < b$ with $b > z$, we have,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[\tau(\hat{V}_z^{\uparrow},[b,+\infty[),+\infty[} \hat{V}_z^{\uparrow} < a\right) \leq e^{-\kappa(b-a)}/(1-e^{-\kappa b}).$$

Proof. Let $T := \tau(\hat{V}_z^{\uparrow}, [b, +\infty[)$. T is a stopping time so, if U is a random variable having the same law as $\hat{V}_z^{\uparrow}(T)$, then $\hat{V}_z^{\uparrow}(T + .)$ is equal in law to $\hat{V}_U^{\uparrow}$, that is, the Markov process that conditionally on $\{U = u\}$ has law $\hat{V}_u^{\uparrow}$. We thus have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[T,+\infty[} \hat{V}_z^{\uparrow} < a\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} \hat{V}_U^{\uparrow} < a\right) = \int_b^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} \hat{V}_u^{\uparrow} < a\right) \mathcal{L}_U(du), \tag{5.101}$$

because almost surely, $U \geq b$. Now, since $\hat{V}_u^{\uparrow}$ is only $\hat{V}_u$ conditioned in the usual sens to remain positive, we have for any $u \geq b$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} \hat{V}_u^{\uparrow} < a\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(0 < \inf_{[0,+\infty[} \hat{V}_u < a\right) / \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} \hat{V}_u > 0\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} \hat{V} < a - u\right) / \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} \hat{V} > -u\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} \hat{V} < a - b\right) / \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} \hat{V} > -b\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $a - u \leq a - b$ for the numerator and the fact that $u \geq b$ for the denominator. Since $\hat{V}$ is the dual of V, the above estimate can be re-written

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} \hat{V}_u^{\uparrow} < a\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{[0,+\infty[} V > b - a\right) / \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{[0,+\infty[} V < b\right) = e^{-\kappa(b-a)}/(1-e^{-\kappa b}).$$

Putting into (5.101) we get the result.

□

The proof of Lemma 5.6 relies on the fact that the hitting times of $V^{\uparrow}$ are stochastically smaller than the hitting times of $V^{\sharp}$, for which we have precise estimates. Here, the procedure to link the hitting times of $\hat{V}^{\uparrow}$ and $\hat{V}$ is different. This is what we do now.

Let us fix $x > 0$. Let m_x be the point where the process $\hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}$ reaches its infimum, $m_x := \sup\{s \geq 0,\ \hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}(s-) \wedge \hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}(s) = \inf_{[0,+\infty[} \hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}\}$. Note that from the absence of negative jumps, the infimum is always reached at least at m_x- so $\hat{V}_y^{\uparrow}(m_x-) = \inf_{[0,+\infty[} \hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}$. The next lemma is contained in Theorem 24 of [7].

Lemma 5.10. *Assume V has unbounded variations, then*

$$\left(\hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}(m_x + s) - \hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}(m_x-),\ s \geq 0\right) \overset{\mathfrak{L}}{=} \hat{V}^{\uparrow}.$$

We can thus obtain $\hat{V}^{\uparrow}$ from $\hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}$, and $\hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}$ is only $\hat{V}_x$ conditioned in the usual sens to remain positive. This allows us to link $\hat{V}^{\uparrow}$ and $\hat{V}$, so we are now able to prove our estimate :

Lemma 5.11. *Assume V has unbounded variations. There are three positive constants c_0, c_1 and c_2 such that*

$$\forall y > 1,\ r > 0,\ \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow}, [y, +\infty[) > r\right) \leq c_0 \left(e^{-\kappa y} + e^{c_1 y - c_2 r}\right).$$

Proof. Let us fix $r > 0$, $y > 1$ and choose $x \in]0, 1[$ (for example $x := 1/2$). According to Lemma 5.10 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow}, [y, +\infty[) > r\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(\hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}(m_x + .) - \hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}(m_x-), [y, +\infty[) > r\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(\hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}(m_x + .), [y + x, +\infty[) > r\right),\end{aligned}$$

because $\hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}(m_x-) \leq x$. Now, if $\hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}$ never reaches $[0, x]$ after the instant $T := \tau(\hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}, [y+x, +\infty[)$, then the minimum m_x is reached before T so

$$\tau(\hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}(m_x + .), [y + x, +\infty[) = \tau(\hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}, [y + x, +\infty[) - m_x = T - m_x \leq T.$$

We deduce that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow}, [y, +\infty[) > r\right) \leq \mathbb{P}(T > r) + \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[T,+\infty[} \hat{V}_x^{\uparrow} < x\right). \tag{5.102}$$

We now bound the two terms of the right hand side. For the first term, since $\hat{V}_x^{\uparrow}$ is only $\hat{V}_x$ conditioned in the usual sens to remain positive, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(T > r) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(\hat{V}_x, [y + x, +\infty[) > r,\ \inf_{[0,+\infty[} \hat{V}_x > 0\right) / \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} \hat{V}_x > 0\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(\hat{V}_x, [y + x, +\infty[) > r\right) / \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[0,+\infty[} \hat{V}_x > 0\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V,]-\infty, -y]) > r\right) / (1 - e^{-\kappa x}).\end{aligned}$$

Combining with Lemma 5.4 we get

$$\mathbb{P}(T > r) \leq c_0 e^{c_1 y - c_2 r}, \tag{5.103}$$

where c_1 and c_2 are the constants in the lemma and $c_0 := 1/(1 - e^{-\kappa x})$. We now turn to the second term of (5.102). According to Lemma 5.9 applied with $z = a = x$ and $b = x + y$ we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{[T,+\infty[} \hat{V}_x^{\uparrow} < x\right) \leq e^{-\kappa y} / (1 - e^{-\kappa(x+y)}) \leq c_0 e^{-\kappa y}. \tag{5.104}$$

Now, combining (5.103) and (5.104) with (5.102) we get the result.

□

We can now use our estimate on the hitting times to bound an exponential functional of $\hat{V}^{\uparrow}$.

Lemma 5.12. *Assume V has unbounded variations. There is a positive constant c such that for all h large enough, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow}, [h, +\infty[)} e^{\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(u)} du \leq e^{(1+\eta)h}\right) \geq 1 - e^{-ch}. \tag{5.105}$$

Proof. We choose $c \in]0, \kappa[$. We have

$$\int_0^{\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow}, [h, +\infty[)} e^{\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(u)} du \leq e^h \tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow}, [h, +\infty[),$$

so

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},[h,+\infty[)} e^{\hat{V}^{\uparrow}(u)}du > e^{(1+\eta)h}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(\hat{V}^{\uparrow},[h,+\infty[) > e^{\eta h}\right) \leq e^{-ch},$$

for any choice of $c \in]0,\kappa[$ and h large enough, according to Lemma 5.11. This yields (5.105).

□

Note that we do not prove an analogue of (5.99) for $\hat{V}^{\uparrow}$, even if it would have been needed to repeat readily the arguments of [2] in our context. This is because the existence of possibly large negative jumps for V do not allow such an estimate to hold in general. Because of this, we have to take some precautions, and in particular, to prove some extra technical estimates in Subsection 5.5.

5.4. **Estimates on the first ascend of h from the minimum.** In order to bound the local time and the time spent by the diffusion between two valleys, we have to study the expectation of some functionals of V involving the first ascend of h from the minimum. This subsection uses the notations and estimates of Subsection 3.5.

Lemma 5.13. *There is a positive constant C such that for h large enough,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\tau^*(h)\right] \leq Ce^{\kappa h}.$$

Proof. We have $\tau^*(h) = m^*(h) + (\tau^*(h) - m^*(h))$, and using Lemma 3.9 we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\tau^*(h)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[S^{h,-}(T_h)\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\tau(V^{\uparrow},h))\right]. \tag{5.106}$$

For the first term, note that $\mathbb{E}[S^{h,-}(T_h)] = \mathbb{E}[S^{h,-}(1)] \times \mathbb{E}[T_h]$ since $S^{h,-}$ is a subordinator and is independent from T_h. Also, recall that $S^{h,-}(1) \leq S(1)$ where $S(1)$ has finite expectation according to Lemma 3.10. Then, T_h follows an exponential distribution with parameter $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{h,+}) \sim ce^{-\kappa h}$, according to Lemma 3.11, where c is the positive constant obtained in the lemma. For h large enough we thus get

$$\mathbb{E}\left[S^{h,-}(T_h)\right] \leq (2\mathbb{E}[S(1)]/c)e^{\kappa h}. \tag{5.107}$$

For the second term, we use Lemma 2.5 of [15] and the fact that, since $V^{\sharp}$ is a spectrally negative Lévy process drifting to $+\infty$, $\tau(V^{\sharp},.)$ is a subordinator having finite expectation (see [3], Section VII.1). We obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\tau(V^{\uparrow},h))\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\tau(V^{\sharp},h))\right] = h\mathbb{E}\left[\tau(V^{\sharp},1))\right]. \tag{5.108}$$

Combining (5.106), (5.107) and (5.108) we get the result.

□

Lemma 5.14. *There is a positive constant C such that*

$$\forall h > 0,\ \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^{\tau^*(h)} e^{V(u)}du\right] \leq Ce^{(1-\kappa)h}.$$

Proof. Since V is spectrally negative, single points are not essentially polar for V so, according to Theorem V.1 of [3], there is $\mathcal{L}_V$, a local time that satisfies the density of occupations formula for V

: almost surely, for all mesurable function f and $t>0$ we have $\int_0^t f(V(s))ds = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)\mathcal{L}_V(t,x)dx$. Therefore, as in the proof of the majoration of $\beta_0(h)$ in Lemma 3.6 of [1] we get :

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^{\tau^*(h)} e^{V(u)}du\right] \leq \int_{-\infty}^{h} e^x \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{L}_V(+\infty,x)\right]dx,$$

and, according to the strong Markov property,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{L}_V(+\infty,x)\right] = \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V,x)<+\infty\right)\times\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{L}_V(+\infty,0)\right],$$

where

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V,x)<+\infty\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{[0,+\infty[} V \geq x\right) = \mathbb{1}_{x\leq 0} + e^{-\kappa x}\mathbb{1}_{x>0}.$$

We thus get

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^{\tau^*(h)} e^{V(u)}du\right] \leq \frac{1}{1-\kappa}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{L}_V(+\infty,0)\right]\times\left(e^{(1-\kappa)h}-\kappa\right).$$

Then, considering the Poisson point process of excursions away from 0 associated with the local time $\mathcal{L}_V(.,0)$, we have that $\mathcal{L}_V(+\infty,0)$ is only the time when occurs the infinite excursion of V, and this follows an exponential distribution with parameter $\eta_V(\xi,\ \zeta(\xi)=+\infty)>0$. As a consequence, $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_V(+\infty,0)]<+\infty$ and the result follows.

□

5.5. **Estimates on the valleys.** We now use the previous results to prove some estimates on the standard valleys.

Lemma 5.15. *For all h large enough we have*

$$\forall j\geq 1,\ \mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{L}_{j-1}}^{\tilde{m}_j} e^{V^{(j)}(u)}du \geq e^{e^{(1-2\delta)\kappa h}}\right) \geq 1-e^{-\kappa\delta h/4}.$$

Proof. Thanks to Remark 3.4 we only need to prove the result for $j=1$. Recall the proof of Lemma 5.5 in which we set $a=h$, $b=e^{(1-\delta)\kappa h}$ and $\eta=\delta/2$. For $h\geq 1$ let us define :

$$p(h) := \mathbb{P}\left(\min\left(\tau(V-\underline{V},h),\tau\left(\underline{V},]-\infty,-\delta h/2]\right)\right)\geq 1\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(T_1\geq 1\right)\geq p(1)>0.$$

Since, from the Markov property, the sequence $(T_i-T_{i-1})_{i\geq 1}$ is *iid*, the probability that $T_i-T_{i-1}<1$ for all $i\leq \lfloor e^{(1-2\delta)h}\rfloor$ is

$$(1-p(h))^{\lfloor e^{(1-2\delta)\kappa h}\rfloor} \leq (1-p(1))^{\lfloor e^{(1-2\delta)\kappa h}\rfloor} \leq e^{-h},$$

for h large enough. Then, recall that we proved that, with probability greater than $1-(b/\eta a+1)e^{-\kappa(1-\eta)a}$ (which is more than $1-e^{-\kappa\delta h/3}$, at least when h is large enough), the index i such that $T_i=\tau(V-\underline{V},h)$ is greater than $2e^{(1-\delta)\kappa h}/\delta h$.

It means that after the $\lfloor e^{(1-2\delta)\kappa h}\rfloor^{th}$ one, V will still make $2e^{(1-\delta)\kappa h}/\delta h - \lfloor e^{(1-2\delta)\kappa h}\rfloor \geq e^{(1-2\delta)\kappa h}$ descents before $\tau(V-\underline{V},h)$ and so, before $\tilde{m}_1$. In $[0,\tilde{m}_1]$, there will therefore be an interval larger than 1 on which $V^{(1)}$ is greater than $e^{(1-2\delta)\kappa h}$. We thus have

$$\int_{\tilde{L}_0}^{\tilde{m}_1} e^{V^{(1)}(u)}du \geq e^{e^{(1-2\delta)\kappa h}}\times 1$$

with probability greater than $1-e^{-h}-e^{-\kappa\delta h/3}$, for h large enough, and the result follows.

□

Lemma 5.16. *Fix $0 < \eta < \alpha < 1$. For h large enough we have*

$$\forall j \geq 1,\ \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{L}_j^\sharp < \tilde{\tau}_j^-(\alpha h),\ \inf_{[\tilde{L}_j^\sharp, \tilde{\tau}_j^-(\alpha h)]} V^{(j)} > (\alpha - \eta)\, h\right) \geq 1 - e^{-\kappa\eta h/3}.$$

It would seem convenient to use the time-reverse property to prove this lemma. However this is not possible here so we have to show that V cannot get too close to its future minimum before time $\tilde{\tau}_j^-(\alpha h)$.

Proof. Thanks to Remark 3.4 we only need to prove the result for $j = 1$. Recall that $\tilde{\tau}_1(h)$ is the first time after $\tilde{L}_1^\sharp$ when $V - \underline{V}$ reaches h and $\tilde{m}_1$ is the associated minimum, so

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{L}_1^\sharp \geq \tilde{\tau}_1^-(\alpha h)\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V - \underline{V}, h) < \tau(\underline{V},]-\infty, -h])\right) \leq 3e^{-\kappa h/2}, \tag{5.109}$$

where the last inequality comes from Lemma 5.5 applied with $a = b = h$, $\eta = 1/2$. When $\tilde{L}_1^\sharp < \tilde{\tau}_1^-(\alpha h)$, let u_1 be the unique point where $V^{(1)}$ reaches its minimum on $[\tilde{L}_1^\sharp, \tilde{\tau}_1^-(\alpha h)]$. On the event $\{\tilde{L}_1^\sharp < \tilde{\tau}_1^-(\alpha h),\ \inf_{[\tilde{L}_1^\sharp, \tilde{\tau}_1^-(\alpha h)]} V^{(1)} \leq (\alpha - \eta)\, h\}$ we have

$$V(\tilde{m}_1) \leq V(u_1) \leq V(\tilde{m}_1) + (\alpha - \eta)\, h \leq V(\tilde{\tau}_1^-(\alpha h)-) - \eta h. \tag{5.110}$$

It implies that $V - \underline{V}$ reaches ηh between u_1 and $\tilde{\tau}_1^-(\alpha h)$, then V descends lower than its minimum level $V(u_1)$ (because $V(\tilde{m}_1) \in [V(u_1) - (\alpha - \eta)h, V(u_1)[$) and then, $V - \underline{V}$ reaches h before V reaches $]-\infty, V(u_1) - (\alpha - \eta)h[$. We thus consider the times when $V - \underline{V}$ reaches ηh and separate them by the times when V gets lower than its previous minimum. We introduce the sequences of stopping times $(S_j)_{j\geq 0}$ and $(T_j)_{j\geq 1}$ where $S_0 := \tilde{L}_1^\sharp$ and

$$T_j := \inf\{t \geq S_{j-1},\ (V - \underline{V})(t) = \eta h\}, \quad S_j := \inf\{t \geq T_j,\ V(t) < \underline{V}(T_j)\}.$$

Note that for all $j \geq 1$, $\underline{V}(T_j) = V(T_j) - \eta h$ and $V(S_j) = \underline{V}(S_j)$. Combining with the Markov property, this implies that the sequences of truncated processes $(V(t + S_{j-1}) - V(S_{j-1}),\ 0 \leq t \leq T_j - S_{j-1})_{j\geq 1}$ and $(V(t + T_j) - V(T_j),\ 0 \leq t \leq S_j - T_j)_{j\geq 1}$ are both *iid*, and the two sequences are independent.

We see that $\tilde{\tau}_1^+(\eta h) = T_{J_0}$ where we define J_0 to be the first index $j \geq 1$ for which $\inf\{t \geq T_j,\ (V - \underline{V})(t) = h\} < S_j$ and $\tilde{m}_1$ is the minimum of V before T_{J_0} ($V(\tilde{m}_1) = \underline{V}(T_{J_0}) = V(T_{J_0}) - \eta h$). Moreover, we just saw that on the event $\{\tilde{L}_1^\sharp < \tilde{\tau}_1^-(\alpha h),\ \inf_{[\tilde{L}_1^\sharp, \tilde{\tau}_1^-(\alpha h)]} V^{(1)} \leq (\alpha - \eta)h\}$, $J_0 \geq 2$ and u_1 is the minimum of V before T_K for some random $K < J_0$ ($V(u_1) = \underline{V}(T_K) = V(T_K) - \eta h$). Using (5.110), we get,

$$\underline{V}(T_{J_0-1}) \leq \underline{V}(T_K) = V(u_1) \leq V(\tilde{m}_1) + (\alpha - \eta)h = \underline{V}(T_{J_0}) + (\alpha - \eta)h = V(T_{J_0}) + (\alpha - 2\eta)h.$$

From the definition of S_j we have $V(S_{J_0-1}) \leq \underline{V}(T_{J_0-1})$ so we get

$$\left\{\tilde{L}_1^\sharp < \tilde{\tau}_1^-(\alpha h),\ \inf_{[\tilde{L}_1^\sharp,\ \tilde{\tau}_1^-(\alpha h)]} V^{(1)} \leq (\alpha - \eta)\, h\right\} \subset \{V(S_{J_0-1}) \leq V(T_{J_0}) + (\alpha - 2\eta)h\}. \tag{5.111}$$

For any $k \geq 1$, the event $\{V(S_{k-1}) \leq V(T_k) + (\alpha - 2\eta)h\}$ only depends on $(V(t + S_{k-1}) - V(S_{k-1}),\ 0 \leq t \leq T_k - S_{k-1})$ whereas the event $\{J_0 = k\}$ only depends on the sequence $(V(t + T_j) - V(T_j),\ 0 \leq t \leq S_j - T_j)_{j\geq 1}$. Partitioning on the possible values for J_0 and using the fact that the sequences $(V(t + S_{j-1}) - V(S_{j-1}),\ 0 \leq t \leq T_j - S_{j-1})_{j\geq 1}$ and $(V(t + T_j) - V(T_j),\ 0 \leq t \leq S_j - T_j)_{j\geq 1}$ are independent and both *iid*, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(V(S_{J_0-1}) \leq V(T_{J_0}) + (\alpha - 2\eta)h) &= \mathbb{P}(V(S_0) \leq V(T_1) + (\alpha - 2\eta)h) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\tau(V - \underline{V}, \eta h) < \tau(V,]-\infty, -(\alpha - \eta)h[)) \\
&\leq (1 + \alpha/\eta)e^{-\kappa\eta h/2}/2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality comes from Lemma 5.5 applied with $a = \eta h$, $b = (\alpha - \eta)h$, $\eta = 1/2$. Combining with (5.111) and (5.109) we get the result for h large enough.

□

Lemma 5.17. *For all h large enough we have*

$$\forall j \geq 1,\ \mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h) - \tilde{L}_{j-1} > e^{(1+\delta)\kappa h}\right) \leq e^{-\delta\kappa h/2}.$$

Proof. Here again, we only need to prove the result for $j = 1$. We have

$$\tilde{\tau}_1^-(h) - \tilde{L}_0 \leq \tilde{\tau}_1(h) - \tilde{L}_0 = \left(\tilde{\tau}_1(h) - \tilde{L}_1^\sharp\right) + \left(\tilde{L}_1^\sharp - \tilde{L}_0\right). \tag{5.112}$$

For the first term, according to the Markov property at $\tilde{L}_1^\sharp$ and the definition of $\tilde{\tau}_1(h)$, we see that $\tilde{\tau}_1(h) - \tilde{L}_1^\sharp$ has the same law as $\tau^*(h)$. We thus have $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\tau}_1(h) - \tilde{L}_1^\sharp > e^{(1+\delta)\kappa h}/2) = \mathbb{P}(\tau^*(h) > e^{(1+\delta)\kappa h}/2)$ and combining with Markov's inequality and Lemma 5.13, we get for h large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{\tau}_1(h) - \tilde{L}_1^\sharp > e^{(1+\delta)\kappa h}/2\right) \leq 2Ce^{-\delta\kappa h}, \tag{5.113}$$

where C is the constant in Lemma 5.13. For the second term, according to the definition of $\tilde{L}_1^\sharp$ and Lemma 5.4 applied with $y = e^{(1-\delta)\kappa h}$ and $r = e^{(1+\delta)\kappa h}/2$ we have, for h large enough :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\tilde{L}_1^\sharp - \tilde{L}_0 > \frac{e^{(1+\delta)\kappa h}}{2}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\tau\left(V,]-\infty, -e^{(1-\delta)\kappa h}]\right) > \frac{e^{(1+\delta)\kappa h}}{2}\right) \leq e^{-h}. \tag{5.114}$$

The combination of (5.112), (5.113) and (5.114) yields the result.

□

5.6. **Estimates on the diffusion in potential V.** We now give an upper bound for the time spent by the diffusion and the local time in the negative half-line. Restricted to the drifted brownian case, our result is a little stronger than Lemma 3.5 of [1]. It is the only estimate that we need for both cases $0 < \kappa < 1$ and $\kappa > 1$.

Lemma 5.18. *Recall the definition of H_- in Subsection 1.2. There is a positive constant C such that for r large enough,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(H_-(+\infty) > r\right) \leq Cr^{-\kappa/(2+\kappa)} \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{]-\infty,0]} \mathcal{L}_X(+\infty, .) > r\right) \leq 3r^{-\kappa/(2+\kappa)}.$$

Proof. From the definition of the local time and formula (2.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_-(+\infty) &= \int_{-\infty}^0 \mathcal{L}_X(+\infty, x)dx = \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{-V(x)}\mathcal{L}_B(\tau(B, A_V(+\infty)), A_V(x))dx \\ &= A_V(+\infty)\int_{-\infty}^0 e^{-V(x)}\mathcal{L}_{B'}(\tau(B', 1), A_V(x)/A_V(+\infty))dx \end{aligned}$$

where $B' := B((A_V(+\infty))^2.)/A_V(+\infty)$. By scale invariance, we see that conditionally to V, B' is a brownian motion so

$$H_-(+\infty) \overset{\mathfrak{L}}{=} A_V(+\infty) \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{-V(x)} \mathcal{L}_B(\tau(B,1), A_V(x)/A_V(+\infty)) dx \tag{5.115}$$

$$\leq \left(\sup_{y \leq 0} \mathcal{L}_B(\tau(B,1), y) \right) \times A_V(+\infty) \times \int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{-V(x)} dx$$

$$= \left(\sup_{y \leq 0} \mathcal{L}_B(\tau(B,1), y) \right) \times A_V(+\infty) \times \int_{0}^{+\infty} e^{\tilde{V}(x)} dx, \tag{5.116}$$

where $\tilde{V}(x) := -V(-x)$. By time reversing, the process $(\tilde{V}(x),\ x \geq 0)$ has the same law as $(V(x),\ x \geq 0)$. As a consequence, the right hand side of (5.116) features three factors, the last two of them being equal in law to $\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(u)} du$. We thus have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(H_-(+\infty) > r\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{y \leq 0} \mathcal{L}_B(\tau(B,1), y) > r^{\kappa/(2+\kappa)} \right) + 2\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(u)} du > r^{1/(2+\kappa)} \right),$$

and combining with inequality (7.13) of [2] for the first term, and the second assertion of Lemma 5.3 for the second term, we get the result for r large enough. For the assertion about the local time, we only replace the integrals on $]-\infty, 0]$ by a supremum (as well as the integral on $[0, +\infty[$ for $\tilde{V}$). Since $\sup \tilde{V}$ follows an exponential distribution with parameter κ, the result follows.

□

The next lemma provides a useful estimate to bound the time spent by the diffusion between two standard valleys. It generalizes a part of Lemma 3.6 of [1].

Lemma 5.19. *Recall the definition of H_+ in Subsection 1.2. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for h large enough,*

$$\mathbb{E}[H_+(\tau^*(h))] \leq Ce^h. \tag{5.117}$$

Proof. The beginning of the proof is similar to the beginning of the proof of Lemma 3.6 in [1]. In fact (3.37) of [1] is still true in our setting, with V instead of the drifted brownian motion :

$$\mathbb{E}[H_+(\tau^*(h))] \leq 2\mathbb{E}\left[\tau^*(h)\right] \times \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^{\tau^*(h)} e^{V(u)} du \right].$$

Combining this with Lemmas 5.13 and 5.14, we get the result.

□

A fundamental point to have the renewal structure for the contributions to time and to local time is the fact that the diffusion never goes back to a previous valley. Let us define

$$X_{\tilde{L}_i} := X(H(\tilde{L}_i) + .)$$

which is, according to the Markov property, a diffusion in the environment V starting from $\tilde{L}_i$. We also denote by $H_{X_{\tilde{L}_i}}(r)$ the hitting time of r by $X_{\tilde{L}_i}$. The following lemma proves that the diffusion does not go back :

Lemma 5.20. *There is a positive constant c such that for h large enough,*

$$\forall i \geq 1,\ \mathbb{P}\left(H_{X_{\tilde{L}_i}}(\tilde{\tau}_i(h)) < H_{X_{\tilde{L}_i}}(+\infty) \right) \leq e^{-ch}.$$

Proof. Let us fix $i \geq 1$. At fixed environment V, $P^V(H_{X_{\tilde{L}_i}}(\tilde{L}_i^*) < H_{X_{\tilde{L}_i}}(+\infty))$ equals

$$= \frac{\int_{\tilde{L}_i}^{+\infty} e^{V(u)}du}{\int_{\tilde{\tau}_i(h)}^{+\infty} e^{V(u)}du} = e^{V(\tilde{L}_i)-V(\tilde{\tau}_i(h))} \frac{\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(u+\tilde{L}_i)-V(\tilde{L}_i)}du}{\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(u+\tilde{\tau}_i(h))-V(\tilde{\tau}_i(h))}du} := e^{V(\tilde{L}_i)-V(\tilde{\tau}_i(h))} I_1/I_2. \quad (5.118)$$

Since $\tilde{L}_i$ and $\tilde{\tau}_i(h)$ are stopping times for V, both I_1 and I_2 have the same law as $\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(u)}du$ even though there are not independent. Then,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(I_1/I_2 > e^{h/4}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(I_1 > e^{h/8}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(I_2 < e^{-h/8}\right) \leq 2\mathcal{C}e^{-\kappa h/8} + ce^{-h/16},$$

where the last inequality and the constants come from the two assertions of Lemma 5.3. It holds for h large enough. From the definition of $\tilde{L}_i$ we have $V(\tilde{L}_i) - V(\tilde{\tau}_i(h)) \leq -h/2$ so the last term of (5.118) is less than $e^{-h/4}$ with probability greater than $1 - 2\mathcal{C}e^{-\kappa h/8} + ce^{-h/16}$ and is bounded by 1 otherwise. Integrating (5.118) with respect to V we thus get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(H_{X_{\tilde{L}_i}}(\tilde{\tau}_i(h)) < H_{X_{\tilde{L}_i}}(+\infty)\right) \leq e^{-h/4} + 2\mathcal{C}e^{-\kappa h/8} + ce^{-h/16},$$

and the result follows.

□

Recall the definitions of $X_{\tilde{m}_j} := X(. + \tilde{m}_j)$ and $H_{X_{\tilde{m}_j}}(r)$. The next lemma proves that the standard valleys are left from the right.

Lemma 5.21. *For h large enough,*

$$\forall i \geq 1,\ \mathbb{P}\left(H_{X_{\tilde{m}_i}}(\tilde{L}_{i-1}) < H_{X_{\tilde{m}_i}}(\tilde{L}_i)\right) \leq e^{-\kappa\delta h/6}.$$

This is where appears a difference with the brownian case. In Lemma 3.2 of [1], they have a similar result with, instead of $\tilde{L}_{i-1}$, an other random time denoted by $\tilde{L}_i^-$. In the context of a Lévy environment, the existence of jumps may allow one of the $\tilde{m}_i - \tilde{L}_i^-$ to be quite small with a non negligible probability, which would allow some standard valleys to be left from $\tilde{L}_i^-$. In fact, we would need an analogue of (5.99) for $\hat{V}^{\uparrow}$ to have the same result as in Lemma 3.2 of [1]. In order to still have the standard valleys left from the right, we have to change our definition of "leave from the right" (replacing $\tilde{L}_i^-$ by $\tilde{L}_{i-1}$). A consequence of this is that the study of the descending parts of the standard h-valleys is more technical (since we have to consider a bigger part than in [1], and we do not know its law precisely) and requires Subsection 5.5. In particular, our proof that the standard valleys are left from the right requires the technical Lemma 5.15, but the idea of the result has no qualitative difference with the drifted brownian case.

Proof. of Lemma 5.21

Let us fix $i \geq 1$. At fixed environment V, $P^V(H_{X_{\tilde{m}_i}}(\tilde{L}_{i-1}) < H_{X_{\tilde{m}_i}}(\tilde{L}_i))$ equals

$$\frac{\int_{\tilde{m}_i}^{\tilde{L}_i} e^{\tilde{V}^{(i)}(u)}du}{\int_{\tilde{L}_{i-1}}^{\tilde{L}_i} e^{\tilde{V}^{(i)}(u)}du} = \frac{1}{1 + \int_{\tilde{L}_{i-1}}^{\tilde{m}_i} e^{\tilde{V}^{(i)}(u)}du / \int_{\tilde{m}_i}^{\tilde{L}_i} e^{\tilde{V}^{(i)}(u)}du} \leq \max\left(1, \int_{\tilde{m}_i}^{\tilde{L}_i} e^{\tilde{V}^{(i)}(u)}du / \int_{\tilde{L}_{i-1}}^{\tilde{m}_i} e^{\tilde{V}^{(i)}(u)}du\right). \quad (5.119)$$

We first provide an upper bound for

$$\int_{\tilde{m}_i}^{\tilde{L}_i} e^{\tilde{V}^{(i)}(u)}du = \int_{\tilde{m}_i}^{\tilde{\tau}_i(h)} e^{\tilde{V}^{(i)}(u)}du + \int_{\tilde{\tau}_i(h)}^{\tilde{L}_i} e^{\tilde{V}^{(i)}(u)}du.$$

According to proposition 3.6, the terms of the right hand side have respectively the same law as $\int_0^{\tau(V^\uparrow,h)} e^{V^\uparrow(u)}du$ and $e^h \int_0^{\tau(V,]-\infty,-h/2])} e^{V(u)}du \le e^h \int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(u)}du$. We thus have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{m}_i}^{\tilde{L}_i} e^{\tilde{V}^{(i)}(u)}du > e^{(1+\delta)h}\right) \le \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{\tau(V^\uparrow,h)} e^{V^\uparrow(u)}du > e^{(1+\delta)h}/2\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(u)}du > e^{\delta h}/2\right). \tag{5.120}$$

For h large enough, the first term of the right hand side is bounded by e^{-h} because of (5.100) and the second is bounded by $2\mathcal{C}\times 2^\kappa e^{-\kappa\delta h}$ because of the second assertion of Lemma 5.3. As a consequence, for h large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{m}_i}^{\tilde{L}_i} e^{\tilde{V}^{(i)}(u)}du > e^{(1+\delta)h}\right) \le e^{-\kappa\delta h/3}. \tag{5.121}$$

A lower bound for $\int_{\tilde{L}_{i-1}}^{\tilde{m}_i} e^{\tilde{V}^{(i)}(u)}du$ is given by Lemma 5.15. Combining with (5.121), we get that for h large enough

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{m}_i}^{\tilde{L}_i} e^{\tilde{V}^{(i)}(u)}du \Big/ \int_{\tilde{L}_{i-1}}^{\tilde{m}_i} e^{\tilde{V}^{(i)}(u)}du \ge e^{-h}\right) \le e^{-\kappa\delta h/5},$$

so integrating (5.119) with respect to V we get the result for h large enough.

□

5.7. **Proof of some facts.** We now prove Facts 4.3, 4.4 and 4.13. Even if they are taken from [1] and [2], their proof use estimates that are only true for the drifted brownian potential. This is why we have to adapt them to our context and to use our estimates instead of the original ones. We shall refer to [1] and [2] for the proofs and only precise what are the differences between their proofs and ours.

Proof. of Fact 4.3

This is Lemma 3.7 of [1]. For the proof, here are the differences :

W_κ is, off course, replaced here by V. The standard valleys are to be considered as the ones defined in our sense. Also, $\tilde{L}_i^*$ of [1] has to be replaced here by $\tilde{\tau}_i(h_t)$ so Lemma 3.3 of [1] can be replaced here by Lemma 5.20 and $\tilde{\tau}_i^*(h_t)$ is like we defined it in Subsection 3.3.

For the step 1, the event $\mathcal{E}_2^{3.7}$ is replaced here by $\cap_{i=1}^{n_t}\{\tilde{\tau}_i^*(h_t) = \tilde{\tau}_i(h_t)\}$ (note that this includes $\{\tilde{\tau}_1^*(h_t) = \tilde{\tau}_1(h_t)\}$) and the negligibility of the complementary is proved by Lemma 3.7 (the constant in the exponential might be different from the one in [1] but it does not matter).

For the step 2, the event $\mathcal{E}_1^{3.3}$ is replaced here by $\cap_{i=1}^{n_t}\{H_{X_{\tilde{L}_i}}(\tilde{\tau}_i(h_t)) > H_{X_{\tilde{L}_i}}(\tilde{m}_{i+1})\}$ and the negligibility of the complementary is proved by Lemma 5.20. Then, estimate (3.34) of [1] (which is, in the proof of Lemma 3.7 there, referred to as "Lemma 3.6") has to be replaced here by Lemma 5.19. For $H_+(\tilde{m}_1)$, it is obviously less than $H_+(\tilde{\tau}_1(h))$ which equals $H_+(\tilde{\tau}_1^*(h))$ on $\{\tilde{\tau}_1^*(h_t) = \tilde{\tau}_1(h_t)\}$ so, here, the expectation $\mathbb{E}[H_+(\tilde{m}_1)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_1^{3.3}}]$ is bounded by $\mathbb{E}[H_+(\tau^*(h))]$, just as the other terms, and in particular, there is no need, here, to bother with the event $\mathcal{E}_3^{3.7}$ nor to specify we are on the event $\mathcal{V}_t$ where the classical and standard valleys coincide.

Finally, to bound $H_-(\tilde{m}_1)$, we see from $t/\log(h_t) > e^{h_t}$ (which is true at least for large t) and Lemma 5.18, that, for t large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(H_-(\tilde{m}_1) > t/\log(h_t)\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(H_-(\tilde{m}_1) > e^{h_t}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(H_-(+\infty) > e^{h_t}\right) \leq Ce^{-\kappa h_t/(2+\kappa)}.$$

□

Proof. of Fact 4.4

The first point is Lemma 3.3 of [2]. For the proof, here are the differences :

W_κ is replaced here by V and we use the notations $m^*(h_t)$ and $\tau^*(h_t)$ instead of $m_1^*(h_t)$ and $\tau_1^*(h_t)$. We change a little the definition of $b(t)$, that is, $b(t) := 6R\phi(t)e^{\kappa h_t}/(1-e^{-\kappa})$ where $R := -\mathbb{E}[V(\tau(V,]-\infty,-1]))]$. Note that R is finite according to Lemma 5.2 and the hypothesis assumed on V. For $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_0^c)$ (where $\mathcal{A}_0$ has the same definition as in the original proof of [2] with, off course, V instead of W_κ), we get a similar upper bound for t large enough, thanks to the second assertion of Lemma 5.3. Because of the negative jumps, we have, before bounding $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_2^c)$, to give a different definition for the stopping times f_i and to define a new event $\mathcal{A}'_2$. First, $f_0 := 0$ and

$$\forall i \geq 1,\ f_i := \inf\left\{x \geq f_{i-1},\ V(x) \leq V(f_{i-1}) - 1\right\}.$$

Let $I(t) := \max\{i \in \mathbb{N},\ f_{i-1} \leq m^*(h_t)\}$, we now define $\mathcal{A}'_2$ by

$$\mathcal{A}'_2 := \{I(t) \leq b(t)/2R\}.$$

We define, for $i \geq 1$, $E_i := \{\sup_{[f_{i-1},f_i]} V - \underline{V} \geq h_t\}$. Since $\inf_{[0,f_{i-1}]} V = V(f_{i-1})$ we have

$$E_i = \left\{\sup_{[0,f_i-f_{i-1}]} V^{f_{i-1}} - \underline{V^{f_{i-1}}} \geq h_t\right\},$$

and because of the Markov property applied at f_{i-1}, the events E_i are independent and have the same probability that we denote by p_t. Also, $I(t)$ is the smallest $i \geq 1$ for which E_i is realized, so $I(t)$ follows a geometric distribution with parameter p_t. Then,

$$p_t := \mathbb{P}(E_1) \geq \mathbb{P}(V \text{ leaves } [-1,h_t] \text{ from above}) \geq (1-e^{-\kappa})e^{-\kappa h_t},$$

where, for the last inequality, we applied Lemma 5.1 with $a = 1$ and $b = h_t$. We deduce

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}'^c_2) = (1-p_t)^{\lfloor b(t)/2R\rfloor} = e^{\lfloor b(t)/2R\rfloor \log(1-p_t)} \leq e^{\lfloor b(t)/2R\rfloor \log(1-(1-e^{-\kappa})e^{-\kappa h_t})} \leq e^{-3\phi(t)}, \quad (5.122)$$

where the last inequality holds for t large enough. Then,

$$\left\{V\left(f_{\lfloor b(t)/2R\rfloor}\right) < -b(t)\right\} \subset \left\{\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor b(t)/2R\rfloor} (V(f_i) - V(f_{i-1}) + R) < -b(t)/2\right\}.$$

The random variables $V(f_i)-V(f_{i-1})+R$ are *iid* having the same law as $V(\tau(V,]-\infty,-1]))+R$, in particular they have 0 mean and belong to L^P (because of Lemma 5.2). We can thus apply successively Markov's and Von Barh-Esseen's inequalities :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(V\left(f_{\lfloor b(t)/2R\rfloor}\right) < -b(t)\right) &\leq \left(\frac{2}{b(t)}\right)^p \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor b(t)/2R\rfloor} V(f_i) - V(f_{i-1}) + R\right|^p\right] \\
&\leq 2\left(\frac{2}{b(t)}\right)^p \times \left(\frac{b(t)}{2R}\right) \times \mathbb{E}\left[|V(\tau(V,]-\infty,-1])) + R|^p\right] \\
&\leq e^{-(p-1)\kappa h_t}, \qquad (5.123)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from the definition of $b(t)$ and holds for t large enough. Also,

$$\mathcal{A}'_2 \cap \left\{V\left(f_{\lfloor b(t)/2R \rfloor}\right) \geq -b(t)\right\} \subset \left\{\inf_{[0,\tau^*(h_t)]} V \geq -b(t)\right\} = \mathcal{A}_2,$$

so combining with (5.122) and (5.123), the upper bound $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_2^c) \leq e^{-2\phi(t)}$ follows (for large t).

Thanks to our definition of f_i, we still have $e^{-V(x)} \leq e^{-V(f_i)+1}$ for $f_i \leq x < f_{i+1}$ so (3.8) of [2] is true in our context.

Our upper bound for $\mathbb{E}[\int_0^{\tau^*(h)} e^{V(u)}du]$ (denoted $\beta_0(h)$ in [2]) is given by Lemma 5.14.

For $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_4^c)$, we use Lemma 3.9 and get

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_4^c) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V^\uparrow, h_t) < 1\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V^\uparrow, h_t) - \tau(V^\uparrow, h_t/2) < 1\right) \leq e^{-ch_t/2},$$

where the last inequality holds for some positive constant c and t large enough, according to (5.98) applied with $\omega = 1$ and $\alpha = 1/2$.

We now justify the second point of Fact 4.4. We treat separately the case $j = 0$. Since $H(\tilde{L}_0) = H(0) = 0$, the term $\mathcal{L}_X(H(\tilde{L}_j), x)$ can be omitted. $\mathbb{P}(\sup_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}_X(H(\tilde{m}_1), x) > r_t)$ is less than

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{]-\infty,0]} \mathcal{L}_X(+\infty, .) > r_t\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{[0,m^*(h_t)]} \mathcal{L}_X(H(\tau^*(h_t)), .) > r_t\right) + \mathbb{P}\big(\tilde{m}_1 \neq m^*(h)(= \tilde{m}_1^*)\big).$$

Putting $r_t := te^{(\kappa(1+3\delta)-1)\phi(t)}$ and applying Lemmas 5.18 and 3.7 together with the first point, we get for some constant C_2' and t large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}_X(H(\tilde{m}_1), x) > te^{(\kappa(1+3\delta)-1)\phi(t)}\right) \leq \frac{C_2'}{n_t e^{\kappa\delta\phi(t)}}. \tag{5.124}$$

For $j \geq 1$, the proof has the same idea as the one of Lemma 3.2 in [2]. Thanks to Lemmas 5.20 and 3.7 we have, for some constant c and t large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{n_t-1} \left\{H_{X_j}(\tilde{m}_{j+1}) < H_{X_j}(\tilde{\tau}_j(h)),\ \tilde{\tau}_j^*(h) = \tilde{\tau}_j(h),\ \tilde{m}_j^* = \tilde{m}_j\right\}\right) \geq 1 - n_t e^{-ch_t}. \tag{5.125}$$

On this event we have that, for $i \in \{1, ..., n_t - 1\}$, the chain of inequalities (3.11) of [2] is still true when $\tilde{L}_i$, $\tilde{m}_i^*$ and $\tilde{\tau}_i^*(h)$ are defined in our sense (in Subsection 3.3) and $\tilde{L}_i^*$ of [2] is replaced by $\tilde{\tau}_i(h)$. Moreover, the last term of this chain of inequality has the same law as $\sup_{x\in[0,m^*(h_t)]} \mathcal{L}_X(H(\tau^*(h_t)), x)$, so combining (5.125) and the first point we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{n_t-1} \left\{\sup_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\mathcal{L}_X(H(\tilde{m}_{j+1}), x) - \mathcal{L}_X(H(\tilde{L}_j), x)\right) \leq te^{(\kappa(1+3\delta)-1)\phi(t)}\right\}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{C_2''(n_t - 1)}{n_t e^{\kappa\delta\phi(t)}}, \tag{5.126}$$

for some constant C_2'' and t large enough. The combination of (5.124) and (5.126) is the sought result.

The third point of Fact 4.4 is Lemma 3.4 of [2]. For the proof, here are the differences :

W_κ is replaced here by V and the standard valleys are to be considered as the ones defined in our sense (in Subsection 3.3). For convenience, we have $r_t = (\phi(t))^2$ (instead of $r_t = C_0\phi(t)$

in [2]). In this proof, we systematically replace $\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t^+)$ of [2] by $\tilde{L}_{j-1}$ (defined in our sens). For $\mathcal{A}_2$, we have that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_2^c)$ is less than

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{m}_j}^{\tilde{\tau}_j(h_t)} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(y)}dy > e^{h_t+2\phi(t)/\kappa}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\int_{\tilde{\tau}_j(h_t)}^{\tilde{L}_j} e^{\tilde{V}^{(j)}(y)}dy > e^{h_t+2\phi(t)/\kappa}\right)$$
$$=\mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{\tau(V^\uparrow,h_t)} e^{V^\uparrow(y)}dy > e^{h_t+2\phi(t)/\kappa}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(e^{h_t}\int_0^{\tau\left(V,\right]-\infty,-\frac{h_t}{2}\left]\right)} e^{V(y)}dy > e^{h_t+2\phi(t)/\kappa}\right),$$

where we used Proposition 3.6 for the laws of $\tilde{P}_2^{(j)}$ and $\tilde{P}_3^{(j)}$,

$$\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\tau(V^\uparrow,h_t) > e^{2\phi(t)/\kappa}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{+\infty} e^{V(y)}dy > e^{2\phi(t)/\kappa}\right),$$
$$\leq e^{c_1h_t - c_2e^{2\phi(t)/\kappa}} + 2\mathcal{C}e^{-2\phi(t)},$$

for t large enough, according to Proposition 5.6 and the second assertion of Lemma 5.3 (the constants are the ones defined in there). For t large enough we get $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_2^c) \leq ce^{-2\phi(t)}$, where c is some positive constant.

The event $\mathcal{A}_3$ of the original proof is not needed here thanks to our definition of $\mathcal{D}_j$, and we redefine

$$\mathcal{A}_4 := \left\{\inf_{[\tilde{\tau}_j^+((\phi(t))^2),\tilde{\tau}_j(h_t)]} \tilde{V}^{(j)} \geq (\phi(t))^2/2\right\}.$$

According to Proposition 3.6 and Lemma 5.7 applied with $a = (\phi(t))^2/2, b = (\phi(t))^2$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_4^c) \leq e^{-2\phi(t)}$ for t large enough. We also redefine

$$\mathcal{A}_5 := \left\{\inf_{[\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t),\tilde{\tau}_j^-((\phi(t))^2)]} \tilde{V}^{(j)} \geq (\phi(t))^2/2\right\} \text{ and } \mathcal{A}_6 := \left\{\inf_{[\tilde{L}_{j-1},\tilde{\tau}_j^-(h_t/2)]} V^{(j)} > h_t/4\right\}.$$

Combining Proposition 3.6 and Lemma 5.9 applied with $z = 0, a = (\phi(t))^2/2, b = (\phi(t))^2$, we get for t large enough

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_5^c) \leq 2e^{-\delta\kappa h_t/3} + 2e^{-\kappa(\phi(t))^2/2}/(1 - e^{-\kappa(\phi(t))^2}) \leq e^{-2\phi(t)},$$

where the last inequality holds for t large enough. According to the definition of $\tilde{L}_j^\sharp$ and Lemma 5.16 applied with $\alpha = 1/2, \eta = 1/4$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_6^c) \leq e^{-\kappa h_t/12}$ for large t.

On $\cap_{i=4}^6 \mathcal{A}_i$, we have $V^{(j)}(x) \geq (\phi(t))^2/2,\ \forall x \in [\tilde{L}_{j-1}, \tilde{L}_j] \cap \mathcal{D}_j^c$ so the conclusion follows as in the proof of Lemma 3.4 in [2] (but here we do not need to intersect with $\mathcal{V}_t$ of [2]). □

Proof. of Fact 4.13

This is Lemma 5.3 of [2]. As in there, let $\sigma_X(a,b) := \inf\{s \geq 0,\ \mathcal{L}_X(s,b) > a\}$ be the inverse of the local time of X at b. Here are the differences with the proof of Lemma 5.3 of [2] :

W_κ is replaced here by V and the standard valleys are to be considered as the ones defined in our sense (in Subsection 3.3). In this proof, we systematically replace $\tilde{L}_1^-$ of [2] by $\tilde{L}_0 = 0$, in particular, the domain of integration in the integral I, which represents the inverse of the local time, is $[\tilde{L}_0, \tilde{L}_1]$.

We get the analogue of (5.22) of [2] using Proposition 4.5. Our lower bound for $\mathbb{P}(A^1(\tilde{\tau}_1^-(h_t/2)) \leq e^{h_t(1+\epsilon)/2})$ and $\mathbb{P}(A^1(\tilde{\tau}_1(h_t/2)) \leq e^{h_t(1+\epsilon)/2})$ come from the proof of Lemma 4.8.

Recall also that, since the domain of integration in I is $[\tilde{L}_0, \tilde{L}_1]$ we have in our case

$$I_2 \leq e^{\epsilon h_t/2} \left(\int_{\tilde{L}_0}^{\tilde{\tau}_1^-(h_t/2)} e^{-V^{(1)}(x)} dx + \int_{\tilde{\tau}_1(h_t/2)}^{\tilde{L}_1} e^{-V^{(1)}(x)} dx \right),$$

with probability larger than $1 - 2e^{-\epsilon h_t/2}$ (note that we took $\epsilon/2$ instead of ϵ and h_t instead of $\log t$). We bound the two integrals using Lemmas 4.6 and 4.7 and get, for t large enough :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(I_2 \leq 2e^{-\epsilon h_t/2} \right) \geq 1 - e^{-c_2 h_t}, \tag{5.127}$$

where c_2 is a positive constant. Our lower bound for R_1^t comes from (4.76). Combing with (5.127) we get for some positive constant c_3 and t large enough,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(I_2 \leq e^{-\epsilon h_t/4} R_1^t \right) \geq 1 - e^{-c_3 h_t}$$

so in place of (5.24) of [2] we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|I - \gamma t R_1^t| \geq e^{-\epsilon h_t/5} \gamma t R_1^t, H_{X_{\tilde{m}_1}}(\tilde{L}_1) > \sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) \geq t(1-x), H_{X_{\tilde{m}_1}}(\tilde{L}_1) < H_{X_{\tilde{m}_1}}(\tilde{L}_0) \right) \leq e^{-c_4 h_t} \tag{5.128}$$

for all t large enough, and where c_4 is a positive constant.

From our definition of e_1 in Subsection 4.2 we still have

$$\sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) > H(\tilde{L}_1) \Leftrightarrow \gamma t > A^1(\tilde{L}_1) e_1 \Leftrightarrow \gamma t R_1 > A^1(\tilde{L}_1) e_1 R_1.$$

(3.18) of [2] has to be replaced here by Lemma 4.10 and, as we already mentioned, (5.22) by Proposition 4.5. In place of (5.26) of [2] we thus have

$$\sigma(\gamma t, \tilde{m}_1) > H(\tilde{L}_1) \Rightarrow \gamma t R_1 > (1 - e^{-c_5 h_t}) H(\tilde{L}_1),$$

for some positive constant c_5, except on a event which probability is less than $e^{-c_6 h_t}$ (for some positive constant c_6). The fact that the constant are modified (with respect to the ones in the original proof) has no importance so we omit to mention it for the rest of the proof.

For $\tilde{f}_\gamma(x)$, note that we use our definition of $\mathcal{D}_1$. According to this definition we have $\mathcal{D}_1 \subset [\tau_1^-(h_t/2), \tau_1(h_t/2)]$ for t large enough, so we can use the lower bounds for $\mathbb{P}(A^1(\tilde{\tau}_1^-(h_t/2)) \leq e^{h_t(1+\epsilon)/2})$ and $\mathbb{P}(A^1(\tilde{\tau}_1(h_t/2)) \leq e^{h_t(1+\epsilon)/2})$ (from the proof of Lemma 4.8) to bound $\tilde{a}$ on $\mathcal{D}_1$.

(5.24) of [2] has, off course, to be replaced here by (5.128). Finally, (3.2) of [2] has to be replaced here by Lemma 5.21.

□

References

[1] P. Andreoletti and A. Devulder. Localization and number of visited valleys for a transient diffusion in random environment. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, pages 1–59, 2015.

[2] P. Andreoletti, A. Devulder, and G. Véchambre. Renewal structure and local time for diffusions in random environment. *Preprint, arxiv 1506.02895 (accepted in ALEA), version of may 12, 2016*, 2015.

[3] J. Bertoin. *Lévy Processes*. Tracts in Mathematics, Cambridge, 1996.

[4] J. Bertoin and M. Yor. Exponential functionals of lévy processes. *Probab. Surveys*, 2:191–212, 2005.

[5] Dimitrios Cheliotis. One-dimensional diffusion in an asymmetric random environment. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincare (B) Probability and Statistics*, 42(6):715 – 726, 2006.

[6] A. Devulder. The maximum of the local time of a diffusion process in a drifted brownian potential. *Preprint, arxiv 0604078*, 2015.

[7] R. Doney. *Fluctuation Theory for Lévy Processes (Summer school, St-Floor France)*. Springer, 2005.

[8] T. Duquesne. Path decompositions for real lévy processes. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincare (B) Probability and Statistics*, 39(2):339 – 370, 2003.

[9] Alessandra Faggionato. The alternating marked point process of h-slopes of drifted brownian motion. *Stochastic Processes Appl.*, 119(6): 1765–1791, 2009.
[10] N. Gantert and Z. Shi. Many visits to a single site by a transient random walk in random environment. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.*, 99: 159–176, 2002.
[11] K. Kawazu and H. Tanaka. A diffusion process in a brownian environment with drift. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, **49**, pages= 189–211, year=1997, ,
[12] J. Neveu and J. Pitman. *Renewal property of the extrema and tree property of the excursion of a one-dimensional Brownian motion. Séminaire de Probabilitées XXIII*, volume 1372. Springer, Berlin, 1989.
[13] K. Sato. *Lévy Processes and Infinitely Divisible Distributions*. Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics, 1999.
[14] A. Singh. Rates of convergence of a transient diffusion in a spectrally negative lévy potential. *Ann. Probab.*, **36**: 279–318, 2008.
[15] G. Véchambre. Exponential functionals of spectrally one-sided lévy processes conditioned to stay positive. *Preprint, arxiv 1507.02949*, 2015.

Université d'Orléans, Laboratoire MAPMO - Fédération Denis Poisson, Bâtiment de mathématiques - Rue de Chartres B.P. 6759 - 45067 Orléans cedex 2, France

E-mail address: Gregoire.Vechambre@ens-rennes.fr